DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 287 603 PS 016 934

AUTHOR Hills, Tynette W.
TITLE All-Day Kindergarten: Resources for Decision-Making.
INSTITUTION New Jersey State Dept. of Education, Trenton. Div. of General Academic Education.
PUB DATE Sep 85
NOTE 103p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Boards of Education; *Decision Making; Educational History; Financial Support; *Kindergarten; *Outcomes of Education; Primary Education; *Program Development; *Program Implementation; Resource Materials
IDENTIFIERS *Full Day Programs; New Jersey

ABSTRACT

This booklet, which was developed to accompany training workshops offered through the regional curriculum service units of the New Jersey State Department of Education, provides an overview of issues involved in the making of educationally sound decisions about establishing and implementing all-day kindergarten programs. The booklet is designed for those who have the responsibility of studying, recommending, or planning an extended-day kindergarten program. Such individuals include district administrators and supervisors, school board members, teachers, parents, and other community representatives who are members of a district study committee. The booklet overviews kindergarten today, and explores (1) reasons for extending to a full-day schedule; (2) effects of all-day kindergarten; (3) planning issues; (4) a typical course of action by local boards of education; and (5) resources for program planning. Appendices provide statements of principles and philosophy of early childhood education; regulations governing kindergarten in New Jersey; comparative findings and annotated reviews of studies of all-day kindergarten; a summary of boards' typical action procedures; resources for obtaining additional assistance; and a guide to the use of Chapter 1 and state compensatory education funds. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED287603

PS 016934

All-Day Kindergarten:

Resources for Decision-Making

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard Vespucci

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

New Jersey Department of Education, Division of General Academic Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ALL-DAY KINDERGARTEN: RESOURCES FOR DECISION-MAKING

Saul Cooperman
Commissioner of Education

Joel Bloom, Assistant Commissioner
Division of General Academic Education

Tynette W. Hills
Principal Author

ED 169334

New Jersey State Department of Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

September 1985
PTM NO. 400.74

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

JOHN T. KLAGHOLZ President	Seaside Park
JAMES JONES Vice President	Teaneck
S. DAVID BRANDT	Cherry Hill
MAUD DAHME	Annandale
BETTY A. DEAN	East Orange
MATEO F. DeCARDENAS	Union City
ANNE S. DILLMAN	Perth Amboy
ROBERT H. MARIK	Princeton
NANCY SCHAENEN	Madison
JAMES M. SEABROOK, SR	Bridgeton
ROBERT J. WOLFENBARGER	Summit
DEBORAH P. WOLFE Representing the State Board of Higher Education	Cranford

Saul Cooperman, Commissioner of Education
Secretary

T. Edward Hollander, Chancellor of Higher Education
Ex-Officio

COMMISSIONER'S FOREWORD

For many years, kindergarten has held a unique place in the lives of children and their parents. It has represented an important step from home into the wider community. Today, even though great numbers of children come to school with backgrounds in child care centers, Head Start programs, and nursery schools, kindergarten still retains its unique importance.

As the typical first level of public school education in New Jersey, the kindergarten year serves as an orientation to the entire elementary-secondary school experience, builds on what children already know, and provides critical learning opportunities. Done well, kindergarten education can make a positive contribution to a child's enjoyment of learning and the family's commitment to it.

New Jersey schools are rising to the challenges of early education in many innovative ways. One of these is the all-day kindergarten schedule. With the support of parents and community and the dedicated hard work of teachers and administrators, the all-day kindergarten can have many beneficial results. However, the responsibilities of all concerned for problem-solving and planning are great. The materials included in this publication were developed and field-tested with districts engaged in making decisions about kindergarten scheduling. Use of the information in these pages can help schools and communities reach responsible decisions that are in the best interests of their young students.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For their many helpful suggestions for the organization and content of this resource guide, special thanks are extended to: Carolann Auriemma, Instructional Specialist, Regional Curriculum Service Unit-Central; Rita Gavzy, Instructional Specialist, Regional Curriculum Services Unit-North; Virginia Medley, Instructional Specialist, Regional Curriculum Services Unit-South and to staff of the Division of General Academic Education: Florence Cucchi, Editor, Operations and Planning Unit and Jacqueline Cusack, Manager, Student Behavior and Development Unit.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	**Introduction**	1
II.	**Today's Kindergarten: An Overview**	3
	Kindergarten in the Elementary-Secondary Education System	3
	The Evolution of Kindergarten	4
	Kindergarten in New Jersey	5
	Contemporary Kindergarten Goals	7
	Pressures for Change in Kindergarten Programs	9
	Alternatives to Traditional Programming	10
III.	**Reasons for Extending to a Full-Day Schedule**	13
	Instructional Rationales	13
	Practical Considerations	14
IV.	**The Effects of All-Day Kindergarten: Does It Make a Difference?**	17
	How Does All-Day Kindergarten Affect Children's Learning?	18
	How Does It Affect Children's Social-Personal Development?	20
	How Do Teachers React?	20
	How Do Parents React?	22
V.	**Planning Issues**	25
	Assessing Needs	25
	Aims and Objectives of the Program	27
	Considering the Developmental Requirements of Young Children	28
	Involving Parents	31
	Staffing Considerations	32
	Pupil Selection Issues	34
	Costs and Resources	36

Page

VI. Typical Course of Action by Local Boards of Education 39

Precipitating Factors 39

Preliminary Board Action 40

Establishment of a Study Team 40

The Committee's Study 40

The Report and Recommendations 42

Action of the Local Board 42

VII. Resources for Program Planning 45

Pupil Screening and Assessment 45

Curriculum Content and Scope 47

Selection of Learning Activities 51

Planning the Schedule 54

Program Evaluation 59

Inservice Training and Supervisory Support 61

References 65

Appendix A. Principles and Philosophy of Early Childhood Education 69

Appendix B. Kindergarten in New Jersey 75

Appendix C. Studies of All-Day Kindergarten 81

Appendix D. Summary of Typical Action Procedures of Local Boards of Education 93

Appendix E. Resources for Additional Assistance 97

Appendix F. Use of Chapter 1/State Compensatory Education Funds 101

Feedback Form 105

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally in New Jersev and elsewhere in the nation, five-year-old children attend kindergarte.. during a morning or afternoon session, each about two and one-half hours in length. This kind of kindergarten schedule, carried out for the full 180-day school year, is looked upon as typical by most parents and educators. However, alternatives to this schedule are under study in many communities, as board members, administrators, teachers, and parents confront social changes, children's learning needs, varying educational resources, and community pressures.

One topic of intense interest in many school communities is the length of the kindergarten day and whether it should be extended. When practical circumstances permit local boards of education to consider a longer day, those responsible for making the decision must also analyze the instructional objectives which might be attained.

This booklet was developed to accompany training workshops offered through the regional curriculum services units of the New Jersey State Department of Education. Its purpose is to provide an overview of issues involved in making educationally sound decisions about establishing and implementing all-day kindergarten programs. It is designed for use by those who have the responsibility to study, recommend, and/or plan an extended-day kindergarten program:

- district administrators and supervisors
- school board members; and
- teachers, parents, and other community representatives who are members of a district study committee.

The booklet presents a brief description of contemporary kindergarten and its place in elementary and secondary education; reasons why the half-day schedule is under scrutiny; instructional objectives which might be met by extending the program; conclusions from research and demonstration programs; suggested planning steps; essentials of programming; and sources of additional information and assistance.

CHAPTER II

TODAY'S KINDERGARTEN: AN OVERVIEW

This chapter offers an overview of kindergarten in the educational experience of children today, tracing its historical development from a small but inspired philosophical movement which nurtured the natural propensities of children to the widespread first level of school which it now represents. Today's kindergarten is described in terms of typical goals, trends and issues in its continuing evolution, and some alternative forms it takes.

Kindergarten in the Elementary-Secondary Education System

Kindergarten is now an accepted part of the school experience of children in most parts of the nation. By the 1985-86 school year, all 50 states will offer publicly funded kindergarten classes for at least some of their five-year-olds. As it has gradually increased in popularity and acceptance as the first level of schooling, its place in the elementary-secondary school program has become more secure and more integrated. For early childhood educators, the news may be both good and bad. While they appreciate the legitimate and stable place kindergarten now occupies in American education, many of them believe that the kindergarten has lost some of the unique qualities it once had.

Contemporary kindergarten programs have taken on these characteristics:

- They are nearly universally a part of children's schooling experiences.
- The distinctions between kindergarten education and elementary education are increasingly blurred.
- Their curricula have been altered by the testing movement and, more subtly, by prescriptive programs originally designed for handicapped children (Spodek, 1983).

There are many reasons to believe that kindergarten holds a unique and meaningful place in the lives of children. It is still the first official step into schooling, which traditionally marks the intervention of the claims of the larger society into what has been the province of parents and family (Hills, 1984; Slater, 1974). As we shall see, any tinkering with accepted traditions about this year of transition between home and school is likely to evoke strong feelings among the affected adults, and it clearly requires careful study and planning.

The traditional half-day program was predicated upon assumptions that five-year-old children need a transition year which balances the amount of time they spend at home with the time they spend in school. Lengthening the kindergarten day is, by definition, tinkering of consequence. Its significance is best understood against a backdrop of the historical development of kindergarten, which has been a special, protected program during most of its existence.

The Evolution of Kindergarten

The kindergarten concept owes its origins to the German philosopher, Friedrich Froebel, who opened the first kindergarten in Blankenburg, Germany, in 1837. This "child's garden" represented the full flowering of Froebel's educational principles, which were based upon his beliefs in the unity of all things and the innate goodness of the child (Weber, 1969). His kindergarten program provided an education with intellectual, moral, and physical aspects, designed to assure the unfolding and maturing of the child's potential, in accordance with the natural laws of growth. The aims of the kindergarten, Froebel believed, could be realized through a teacher-directed curriculum based on children's interests and needs, including play, exploration, social interaction, songs, and games (Ross, 1976).

These notions were revolutionary at a time when curriculum was likely to be arbitrary and content-centered, and teaching was characterized as an attempt to "put something into" children. Froebel's kindergarten concept and its curriculum were so carefully unified that they tended to be disseminated as an entity (Weber, 1969). Thus, as his ideas spread to other parts of Europe and to the United States, the fledgling kindergarten movement brought with it Froebel's philosophical assumptions and educational principles, which were to influence the education of four to six year-old-children for many years.

A short 20 years after the Blankenburg program was opened in Germany, a kindergarten was established in Wisconsin. This and the other pioneer programs were initiated by persons who had learned directly from Froebel's lectures, writings, or demonstrations. The Wisconsin kindergarten became the prototype of a number of similar programs which German-American educators established in the bilingual German-English Academies of the 1860s and 1870s or other schools (Weber, 1969).

By the turn of the century, kindergartens were operating in many cities, often sponsored by philanthropic associations to help the children of the poor, who had immigrated in search of factory work. In the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries, the cities experienced great influxes of immigrants, and the slums were spawned, with the resulting misery so costly to human beings and their societies (Whipple, 1929).

The "kindergartners," as the early teachers were called, worked in settlement houses and similar facilities to foster the natural development of children and protect them from unwholesome influences. Faced with shortages of health and social services, the kindergartners taught in the morning and performed a variety of welfare services afterwards: seeking out employment for the unemployed, locating health provisions for the ill, and visiting homes to instruct parents in child care and nutrition. In many instances, the kindergarten program offered education and care for children for both morning and afternoon, since the parents were at work in the factory, and the slum dwellings were not considered safe for unsupervised children.

As the philanthropic associations became unable to sustain such a comprehensive effort alone, and as public school systems began to grow in availability and scope, kindergartens gradually moved into the public schools. First, the philanthropic associations asked only for space for the programs, retaining for themselves the responsibility for operational expenses and salaries. Later, boards of education bowed to demand and undertook full responsibility. In 1870, St. Louis became the first public school system to provide tax-supported kindergartens. From that time, there has been a clear and steady trend to integrate the kindergarten into the typical program of elementary and secondary education.

There is evidence that many early kindergartens operated on a full-day schedule, undergoing reductions in time as the popularity of kindergarten education grew and enrollment increased. By 1969, 90 percent of the nation's kindergartens offered half-day programs five days a week, and the shorter session had become the norm (Cleminshaw & Guidubaldi, 1969).

As it evolved, coming into closer contact with the customary basic schooling, the kindergarten underwent inevitable alterations in its Froebelian-inspired characteristics. In the history of American kindergarten education in this century, several identifiable models have guided the development of programs for five-year-old children (Hills, 1984). These models are based upon the following primary emphasis:

- **socialization**, with emphasis on self-discipline, harmonious social relationships, and behavior patterns which facilitate successful learning in school;
- **humanistic**, with emphasis on self-actualization and experiences of self-worth;
- **developmental**, with emphasis on a sense of competence and mastery in both intellectual and affective domains; and
- **academic**, with emphasis on formal readiness and introduction of academic content and skills.

Most kindergartens, of course, have not been pure examples of any one of these, and many of them have drawn their objectives from combinations of all four approaches.

Kindergarten in New Jersey

In New Jersey, five-year-old children have been included in the public school system since its inception. The New Jersey Constitution was amended in 1875 to provide for the maintenance and support of a "thorough and efficient" system of free public schools for children between the ages of five and eighteen years. A few years earlier, in 1871, the New Jersey Legislature had increased state financial aid to education, first begun on a small scale in 1816 (Rosser, 1971). Simultaneously, the

Legislature required districts to augment the state funds as necessary so that nine months of free schooling would be available to all children, ages five to eighteen, who elected to attend. Action on this matter culminated several years of controversy and feverish advocacy and made New Jersey the last of the 37 states then in the union to provide free public schooling. The first compulsory education law came along shortly, in 1873.

During those years, five-year-old children received no special treatment in school. The vast majority of schooling was carried out in non-graded classes, usually in one-room school houses, where the teacher might separate pupils into two groups, primary and beyond primary (Rosser, 1971). Not surprisingly, attendance was much greater in the cities than in the rural areas of the state. In 1879-80, 47 percent of city-dwelling five- to six-year-olds attended public schools; 16 percent attended private schools; 37 percent remained at home (New Jersey State Board of Education, 1880). Those in schools were taught the rudiments of reading, writing, and arithmetic through the same schedule and calendar as older children.

However, the kindergarten movement was making itself known in New Jersey, as elsewhere in the Northeast and in the Midwest. In fact, historical records show that a kindergarten program had been added to the German-English Academy in Newark in 1861 (Weber, 1969). Legislation which permitted local boards of education to establish kindergartens as an integral part of the public school system was passed in March, 1900 (West, 1964). At first, only the city school systems did so, and the 1900-1901 kindergarten enrollment was reported to be about 15,066. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction hailed this development with pride, endorsing the special worth of kindergarten as follows:

> ...the spontaneity and joy of play is gradually and skillfully brought to bear upon work and the child thus early and unconsciously is made aware that enthusiasm lightens labor (West, 1964, p. 82).

Subsequently, new classes were formed in cities and towns across the state, and enrollment steadily increased. Educators predicted that every graded school would have a kindergarten department soon (New Jersey State Board of Education, 1904).

Kindergartens spread more slowly in the rural areas. Their development was considerably facilitated by "helping teachers" who were staff members of the State Department of Education, assigned to offices of the County Superintendents of selected counties. They supervised classroom teachers, many of whom were inadequately trained, providing the same support services as local administrators and supervisors did in the more complex city school systems. Beginning in 1916, these helping teachers operated as "a normal school on the job," to upgrade the quality of instruction in kindergarten where necessary (West, 1964). During these years, many kindergartens were operated on the same schedule as other

classes. Thus, large numbers of five-year-olds routinely attended school for four or more hours during most of the first half of this century, as many mature New Jerseyans can attest.

In the 1940s, the State Board of Education adopted a set of minimum standards for approval of kindergarten programs. These regulations have been amended from time to time. Together with provisions specifying requirements for teacher certification, facilities, the length of the school year, and others which apply to school programs generally, these regulations establish the minimal standards for the development and implementation of kindergarten programs. According to the regulations, the kindergarten school day must be at least two and one-half hours long, in contrast with the four hours required for other grade levels. The half-day program has been typical in most New Jersey school districts for many years. (See Appendix B, p. 75, for current code provisions for kindergarten.)

Today, kindergarten is an integral part of the public school system and has been for many years. Kindergarten programs are financed by state and local funding in the same way as all other classes and levels of elementary and secondary school. In fact, despite the fact that most kindergarten pupils attend a daily session of only 150 minutes, they are counted in the formulas for state aid on the same basis as older pupils who attend a much longer minimum school day.

In the mid-1980s, approximately 74,277 pupils attend kindergarten in 1395 schools in 506 local school districts.* Records indicate that about 87 of these local districts have at least one all-day or extended-day program; these longer sessions involve 8,034 five-year old pupils. In addition, approximately 5,739 four-year-olds are enrolled in a kindergarten (sometimes termed a prekindergarten, although that term does not appear in New Jersey educational statutes and code). For those children, kindergarten is likely to be a two-year program, with each year designed to meet their developmental and learning needs.

Contemporary Kindergarten Goals

Contemporary kindergarten goals address the age-old questions which shape educational programs:

- How do children learn?
- What should they learn?
- What should teachers do to teach them?
- When should particular kinds of learnings be introduced?

---

* 1983-4 enrollment data, New Jersey State Department of Education.

Two major views on these questions dominate contemporary conceptions of kindergarten education, and they seem to point kindergartens in opposite directions (Cohen & Rudolph, 1977). They are the so-called "traditional" kindergarten and the "academic" kindergarten. Their primary differences stem from contrasting beliefs which lead to different answers to these questions (Barbe, Milone, Lucas, & Humphrey, 1980; Cohen & Rudolph, 1977):

- The traditional kindergarten emphasizes informal learning activities in a relatively unstructured environment. It provides concrete learning materials, rich oral and written language experiences, and active learning modes, including participation in natural physical and social events and play. It is based on the assumption that the children will acquire a desirable store of affective and linguistic knowledge and skills through informal means, as a foundation for future academic learning.

- The academic kindergarten emphasizes formal learning, through teacher-planned and focused academic activities. It provides deliberate instruction in pre-academic skills which are prerequisite to reading, writing, mathematics, and the content subjects which dominate the curriculum in the coming grades. It is based on the assumption that pre-academic skills are acquired through direct instruction and rarely through incidental methods of learning.

Most kindergartens draw their aims and objectives from a combination of these two. Many authorities believe that both are important if kindergarten is to provide a firm foundation for future school success. In kindergarten:

> Basic readiness skills become part of the child's repertoire, attitudes toward school and learning are formed, and interpersonal and linguistic abilities are put to a test within the context of a cultural institution (Barbe, Milone, Lucas, & Humphrey, 1980, p. 1).

Kindergarten objectives vary from one program to another primarily in their relative emphasis upon different aspects of growth and development: social relations, aesthetic expression, perceptual-motor development, symbolic representation of thought and language, and achievement motivation. The breadth of these dimensions makes possible the wealth of variations seen in kindergarten programs. In fact, the thread which unifies the diversity of kindergarten experience in our country may be the shared value which kindergarten teachers place on the growth of the "whole" child (Evans, 1975), despite the evident differences among curricula and classroom practices.

Pressures for Change in Kindergarten Programs

Kindergarten is not isolated from the trends and issues which affect elementary and secondary education. It is a legitimate and integral part of most children's basic school experience, and its objectives and teaching-learning methodology are less likely to be set apart from those of the rest of education than was the case in the past. Consequently, this first level of schooling is vulnerable to many pressures for change.

The ferment which characterizes kindergarten programming appears to have multiple causes, including, for example, changes in:

- goals and curriculum at other levels of education, resulting in new expectations of the kindergarten year;
- conceptions of children's development and learning;
- family roles and structures;
- neighborhood and residential patterns; and
- children's preschool experiences.

In recent years, kindergartens have felt the pressure of public demand for improvement in basic skills instruction. In response, some schools have introduced formal readiness and exposure to beginning reading and mathematics, formerly reserved for first grade. Others have stress and language and intellectual learning, such as dealing with physical objects, events, concepts, and the like.

Paralleling these developments, we have changed some of our basic assumptions about what and how young children learn. At a younger age, than was formerly believed, children are capable of learning and organizing many concepts about the world in which they live, about the way it "works," and about the people with whom they interact. Both educators and parents now recognize the importance of early learning to later school success.

Roles and responsibilities of family members have been altered by the circumstances of modern life for many families. There are more families with both parents in the work force, and there are more families headed by a single working parent. These demographic changes are associated with the sweeping social and economic influences of our technological society, as well as shorter term influences such as recessions, employment conditions, and the women's movement. For example, women in all times and all places have made an economic contribution to their families, but now it is less likely that they can do so within the home setting. In small families with few adult relatives available during the day, working parents often must seek out programs and services which will

supplement their own care, guidance, and supervision of their children. These are some of the current conditions which may lead parents to welcome an extension of the school day.

Parents may particularly appreciate a longer kindergarten program when their children have been in one or more years of preschool education, as is the case with approximately one half of the children who begin school each year. In some communities in New Jersey, as elsewhere in the country, all entering kindergarten pupils have been to a nursery school, Head Start, or child care center program. While these preschool programs vary considerably, the children in them have learning experiences in groups and individually, under the supervision of someone who serves as a teacher.

The widespread acceptance of preschool education thus constitutes another source of pressure for change. Kindergarten was once viewed as a preliminary step before more formal instruction took place. In the kindergarten, children were expected to learn to relate to a teacher, communicate with her (kindergarten teachers have always been predominantly female), follow her directions, meet her expectations, share adult attention and materials with other children, and get along sociably with their peers under her benign supervision. Engaging in these socialization experiences would help the children learn to like school and adopt the behaviors and attitudes which are necessary for efficient learning (Weber, 1969). Now, when so many children attain many of these objectives in a preschool program, it has become desirable for kindergartens to change -- to do something else, to do something better, or to do something more. Or so say many.

Alternatives to Traditional Programming

Alternatives to the traditional 150-minute kindergarten class are under study by many local boards of education in New Jersey and other states. Numbers of school systems have begun to experiment with extended and/or full-day sessions. In fact, several states (e.g., Hawaii and North Carolina) offer full day schedules as the standard program, and, by 1980, 30 percent of all kindergarten pupils in this country attended all-day classes (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1982). By 1984, about one-third of the nations kindergarten pupils were attending full time (Lacayo, 1984).

Other variations are also being tried. Although the half-day schedule is still the norm, these types of schedules may be found in kindergarten classes in New Jersey:

- full-day -- a program extended to the same length of session as that of elementary school;

- extended day -- an extension of the 150-minute core program on a daily or other basis for secial purposes or for selected pupils (e.g., supplemental instruction);

- optional full-day -- a core program of 150 minutes or more for all enrolled pupils, with voluntary or optional enrollment in the remainder of the full-day session; and

- prekindergarten -- usually, a kindergarten which enrolls four-year-old pupils, who will enter the regular kindergarten the following year as five-year-olds.

All of these constitute an extension of time, either on a daily basis or by an additional year, beyond the minimum length of the kindergarten day required by the New Jersey Administrative Code. (Appendix B, p. 75, shows the statutes and code provisions which establish the minimum legal standards for kindergarten programs and guide their development.)

The existence of such a wide variation in program schedules bears testimony that there is probably no single best schedule. The schedule provides the time during which a teacher and the pupils interact with each other and with the teaching-learning activities in the classroom environment. All of the elements -- time, people, materials, learning activities, and setting -- are essential to the teaching-learning equation, and all must be included in the careful planning on which programmatic changes should be based.

CHAPTER III

REASONS FOR EXTENDING TO FULL-DAY SCHEDULE

When local boards of education study the issue of lengthening the kindergarten school day, they have in mind both their educational objectives and needs and the circumstances which would make it possible. This chapter summarizes the practical and educational reasons why many communities are currently considering an all-day or extended day program.

Instructional Rationales

In New Jersey and elsewhere, local school systems are attempting to respond to changing circumstances and needs -- among families, in the community, in educational theory and practice, and in the economics of education. The reasons local districts consider alternatives to the typical kindergarten schedule are often practical. For example, resources necessary for an extension of the school day may be newly available. However, it is clear that significant changes in programming should be based on sound educational rationales.

In contemporary times, many kindergartens have borne the brunt of various trends in elementary schooling -- tests and measures for assessment and program evaluation, emphasis on basic skills, and the like. These conservative approaches to public education, together with two decades of research on early childhood education, have heightened the expectations which parents and educators have about what young children can learn. Consequently, many kindergarten programs now make heavy, sometimes unrealistic demands upon young children.

At the same time, the nation's schools have concentrated on equity, making available a greater variety of educational programs which meet the needs of particular groups of students. Examples are special programs for children with atypical learning needs and handicapping conditions, for children from non-English-speaking homes, and for those whose readiness for school-related learnings is less developed than that of most children.

To carry out their expanded responsibilities to offer a meaningful and effective program for all kindergarten children, many school districts are considering lenghtening the school day. They look to that additional time as a way to:

- pace instruction to help children acquire new skills and concepts so that they have time to practice, apply, and consolidate their new learning;

- enrich a program of skill acquisition with language experiences, social interaction with peers and teacher and concrete experiences in science, math, and social studies;

- provide more effectively for the individual needs of children who come from diverse family circumstances and varied preschool backgrounds;

- plan specialized programming for identified children -- preventive services, special needs and handicapping conditions, and gifted/talented programs; and

- assess the strengths and needs of pupils in depth, through observation and analysis of children's work, using the information for planning instruction.

In short, many school districts are looking to the lengthening of the kindergarten school day as a way to improve kindergarten education.

Practical Considerations

The reasons local boards of education consider an extension of the kindergarten day are often practical. Indeed, it is unlikely that proposals to lengthen kindergarten sessions would have received favorable attention in most communities during the post World War II years of high enrollment. In contrast with that period, many communities now find themselves with declining school enrollment. This phenomenon is a major factor enabling local districts to study the feasibility of extending the kindergarten program. Other factors which are often cited include these:

- unused classrooms and other available facilities;

- under-utilized, tenured teachers;

- need to reduce costs of bus transportation; and

- desirability of closing and consolidating schools.

Declining enrollment and population shifts affect school districts in different ways: some must extend their resources to meet a relatively stable pupil population or even a growing one, while others have available classrooms and teachers to assign in new ways. Whatever the changes, it remains necessary to allocate resources so as to meet objectives and contain costs. For these reasons, many school administrators must explore the possibility of changes in a wide variety of budget-related items including curricula, classroom schedules, staff support, transportation schedules, and school assignments.

The support or opposition of parents and community members can be a powerful influence on decisions about all-day kindergartens. Often school boards and school personnel are reluctant to consider family factors in their decisions about educational programs. However, these factors loom large in the lives of pupils and their families, who are affected by demographic forces over which neither they nor the schools have control.

In other times and places, decisions about schooling have been based in part on the needs of families and communities. For example, the length of the typical elementary and secondary school sessions and the yearly school calendar derive from a time when agriculture dominated many regions, and school children were needed to help with the farm chores. Today, some school systems are seeking ways to accommodate to the realities of modern family and community life, while delivering the best educational programs possible. For some of these districts, an all-day kindergarten program may be just such an adjustment.

While it is the availability of necessary resources and community support that makes it possible for districts to consider alternatives to current programs, it is equally clear that changes in programming should be based on sound educational rationales. School board members and administrators are held strictly accountable for the outcomes of educational programs and their cost-effectiveness. Recommendations to extend or double the amount of the time pupils spend in a kindergarten program should be based on careful study of local district needs and objectives, the experience of other schools, and the research literature, as well as an assessment of available resources for implementing such programs.

CHAPTER IV

THE EFFECTS OF ALL-DAY KINDERGARTEN:

DOES IT MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

> In this chapter, the findings of research and demonstration projects are summarized. The predominantly positive results are presented in terms of the effects on children's intellectual and social-personal development; reactions of teachers to the change; and attitudes of parents. Comparative results are referenced in accompanying charts (See Appendix C, p. 81).

As the trend to lengthen the time children spend in kindergarten has been developing and accelerating, the results of research and demonstration programs have been published in books, technical reports, and journal articles. By now, there are numerous sources of information about the effects of extending the program -- effects on the pupils' learning and on their affective and physical development; on the teachers' perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages; and on parents' attitudes toward the change. Personnel of school districts which are considering an all-day kindergarten will want to survey this information.

The literature reviewed in this resource guide includes only those studies which compare the effects of daily, full-year half-day sessions and "all-day" programs (i.e., four or more hours). Readers should be forewarned that some reviews of research on this issue compare half-day schedules with full alternate day programs, failing to make clear that they are comparing only a scheduling difference, not total time in the program. (Such variations are permissible in some states, but not in New Jersey.) Many of those studies report finding no significant differences between groups of children in the two types of scheduling.

In the following pages, the major findings of the published reports on all-day versus half-day kindergarten schedules are summarized. Also, Figure 1, (Appendix C, p. 83) displays the highlights of several major studies on the all-day kindergarten, permitting comparison among those studies in terms of the research question or the program objective, the nature of the program, and findings and conclusions. Full citations may be found in the References, (pp. 65-88), so that readers may locate the reports themselves. An annotated bibliography of available reviews of the literature is included in Appendix C, p. 90).

How Does All-Day Kindergarten Affect Children's Learning?

Short-Term Effects. In the great majority of research reports, the children in the extended sessions have shown more favorable short-term effects, as demonstrated in post-tests and other data collection. These measures have included standardized readiness and achievement tests and criterion-referenced measures. Typically, the investigators have wanted to know how the increased time in kindergarten has affected some or all of the following:

- prereading skills,
- language comprehension -- productive and receptive,
- sensory-motor functioning, and
- task attention and task persistence.

In some of the experimental programs, the curriculum was deliberately kept as similar to that of the standard kindergarten program as possible, in order to collect information about the time variable itself. In the Evansville program (Humphrey, 1980), the longer time was used to enrich and extend learning horizontally. Then, when the all-day pupils demonstrated readiness, their teachers moved ahead to more formal academic instruction as they deemed it appropriate. In the Hamilton Township program (Gittelman, 1983), parental concern about equal learning opportunities for pupils in both the regular program and the pilot kindergarten motivated district leaders to keep the curricula the same. All-day pupils were not advanced academically; enrichment was horizontal, not vertical. As a result, evaluators believe that the potential for increased achievement for the all-day group was not fully demonstrated.

As indicated on the summary charts, (Figure 1, Appendix C, pp. 83-89), program or research objectives have often focused on a particular subgroup of kindergarten pupils. In most cases, children were selected on the basis of one or more of these characteristics:

- They were predicted to be low achievers;
- They resided in urban or rural areas;
- They were of low socioeconomic backgrounds.

For this reason, the research base on all-day kindergarten provides us with more information about the effects of a longer school day on those children than on others. From the findings of most such studies, we can conclude that benefits accrued to the children who had the longer programs. A longer program may help low-achieving children overcome some of their problems and narrow the differences between themselves and the more advantaged pupils (Neiman & Gastright, 1981; Adcock, Hess, & Mitchell, 1980).

A few studies have deliberately included middle-class youngsters, either in matched-group procedures, or in schoolwide pilot programs (Gittelman, 1983; Humphrey, 1983; Winter & Klein, 1970) . It seems apparent that the advantaged children gain more in the lengthened sessions also, although the greatest rate of gain may be seen among children at greater educational risk.

In short, the research and demonstration programs have shown these results:

- All-day everyday programs have positive effects on readiness for formal academic learning.
- The additional time for learning strengthens skill acquisition and concept development.
- The beneficial effects apparently occur for pupils from all backgrounds, although they may be greater for pupils who enter kindergarten with lower levels of sensory-motor skills, language ability, and social experience.

Long-Term Effects. Most of the "long-term" effects of all-day programming have been measured at first grade level (Humphrey, 1980; McClinton & Topping, 1981; Winter & Klein, 1970). In both standardized tests and teacher ratings, children from all-day everyday programs were more advanced than their half-day counterparts. By the end of the first grade, all-day pupils from both advantaged and disadvantaged family and community backgrounds were rated as higher in achievement by their teachers (Winter & Klein, 1970). Where differences in standardized tests were inconclusive, Winter and Klein hypothesize that the tests were not designed to measure the higher levels of achievement which these all-day pupils could have demonstrated.

Humphrey (1983) did a follow-up study at third and fourth grades on pupils who had been in the original all-day everyday kindergarten project in Evansville, Indiana. He looked at report cards, including conduct assessments, and grade retention records, as well as a standardized test, the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills. Differences between the pupils who had been in the all-day kindergarten and their peers who had not favored the former. Humphrey's subjects were representative of the wide range of pupils in the entire Evansville school system.

Neiman and Gastright (1981) undertook an eight-year follow-up study of pupils who had been in all-day kindergarten funded through Title I, of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act. They wanted to ascertain the stability of the gains originally obtained from participation in a prekindergarten program, followed by an all-day kindergarten. They found that, at the end of fourth and eighth grades, the all-day pupils demonstrated higher achievement in reading and mathematics. Fewer of them had been required to repeat a grade or had been placed in a special education class.

With the increased interest in longer kindergarten sessions, it is likely that we will have more longitudinal and follow-up studies evaluating the stability of the short-term effects. Therefore, it may be helpful to acknowledge that the statistical reality known as regression to the mean will play a part in the findings, just as it did in the Neiman and Gastright (1981) study. In effect, the children who scored higher on whatever measures were administered at the end of the all-day kindergarten would tend to score closer to the average of all pupils in later years (Ary & Jacobs, 1976). This seems to be because there is not a perfect correlation between high achievement in all-day kindergarten and high achievement in later school years; other variables intervene and affect the outcomes. (This seems entirely reasonable. Perhaps it is not reasonable to expect that an experience offered to five-year-olds will indefinitely determine their success rate in succeeding years and more complex circumstances.)

How Does It Affect Children's Social-Personal Development?

As noted earlier, objectives for kindergarten have incorporated a wide scope of concerns -- intellectual, psychosocial, and physical. Accordingly, some of the studies of all-day kindergarten have reported effects on children's emotional and physical well-being, as well as their cognitive status. Humphrey (1980) reported that fourth and eighth graders who had been in all-day programs at kindergarten level showed more positive self-concepts. Teachers have reported that all-day kindergarten graduates adjust more readily in first grade, both socially and academically (McClinton & Topping, 1981). Both teachers and parents have reported that all-day kindergarten pupils have greater enthusiasm for school.

More is known about the effects of all-day programming on children's learning in intellectual and language areas than about the effects on social-personal functioning and other affective areas. One study (Gittelman, 1983) used report card data to assess the effects of the longer time on such qualities as social development, creative expression, and work habits. No significant differences were found between the full- and half-day pupils. None of the studies has suggested that the all-day kindergarten has been damaging to the social and personal development of kindergarten pupils.

How Do Teachers React?

The attitudes of kindergarten teachers toward a move to all-day programming arise from a complex blend of their perceptions of current conditions and the values associated with their training and teaching experiences. Many kindergarten teachers feel frustrated by the almost continual bombardment of changes directed to kindergarten during the last two decades. They receive the fallout when other levels of education heighten the expectations for children's academic learning. Their instructional materials and the attitudes of other educators and parents reflect new conceptions of what children can do and what should be

expected of them. They face heterogeneous classes of children who come from widely differing backgrounds of preschool experience. Teachers are aware of changing family roles and responsibilities, making their relationships with parents unpredictable and sometimes problematic.

Kindergarten teachers in New Jersey tend to be veterans in the assignment, many of them having taught kindergarten for 15 or more years (Hills, 1984). This means that their initial teacher training, which may have been directed especially to kindergarten education, occurred well before some of the newer conceptions of children's learning and before the more recent emphasis on academic curricula in lower levels of schooling. For the present corps of kindergarten teachers, there are many sources of potential conflict between their training and beliefs and what some schools and communities now demand.

Large numbers of kindergarten teachers have articulated these concerns (New Jersey Association of Kindergarten Educators, 1982):

- The uniqueness of kindergarten is being threatened by the demand that it become more and more similar to first grade. (Cohen & Rudolph [1977] pointed out that formal academics and structured teaching in kindergarten have been spreading at a time when first grades across the nation have been becoming more informal, with more integrated instructional approaches.)

- The increased demands for formal, academic instruction are grossly inappropriate for some pupils.

- Pressures on the typical 150-minute kindergarten session have driven out of the curriculum the kinds of learning activities which are both developmentally appropriate and motivating for young children -- for example, art, music and movement, sociodramatic play, and the like.

- These pressures on the half-day program are compounded by the continuing practice of assigning teachers to a morning and an afternoon class, each with an enrollment of up to 25 pupils.

Such concerns as these are leading many kindergarten teachers to promote the idea of longer daily sessions. They believe that the additional time would help them carry out the curricular objectives their districts have adopted and restore to the program the additional learning activities which help students extend and strengthen their understandings, consolidate new learning, practice skills, and become enthusiastic about school. Many teachers believe that the longer sessions would foster greater individualization, one-to-one relationships and small group instruction. Finally, many teachers would like to work with a single class of children, reducing by about half the number of pupils for whom they are responsible.

On the other hand, some kindergarten teachers doubt that five-year-olds are physically and emotionally mature enough to engage in school work efficiently for a whole day. They wonder about their ability to direct and maintain attention in learning tasks for that length of time. Would not most of the additional time be taken up by routines such as snack times, lunch, rest, and so on, not markedly adding to instructional time? Over the course of the year, might not youngsters be adversely affected by the reduced time in their homes and at free play in their neighborhoods?

Teachers' attitudes are critical in the decision about an all-day program and the way it is implemented. In many of the studies summarized in Appendix C (pp. 83-89, attitude changes have been assessed by contrasting teachers' views at the beginning and the end of the kindergarten year (Gittelman(s), 1983; Humphrey, 1980, 1983; Winter & Klein, 1970). Most of these show that teachers were enthusiastic about the all-day format and preferred to teach it, even though some of them had been reluctant at the start. Any concerns about children's excessive fatigue and over-stimulation were not borne out; they felt more effective as teachers; the children learned more; and they were able to include in their instruction a greater variety of more interesting learning activities. (See also McClinton & Topping, 1981.)

In a study which dealt just with teachers' attitudes, (Herwig & Pinsky, 1982) teachers of all-day programs reported feeling a higher degree of rapport with the other elementary school teachers than before. Their altered schedules permitted them to take part in the regular ongoing faculty activities and to have informal contacts with other teachers also. After reviewing available research studies, Beckner and others (1978) concluded that many kindergarten teachers feel frustrated in their efforts to meet the needs of up to 50 children in two half-day classes. As a result, these teachers reported lower self-esteem than did teachers of a single all-day class. Unrelated research suggests that teachers' self-esteem affects pupil self-confidence and achievement (Beckner et al., 1978).

Teachers in the Herwig and Pinsky study asked for adequate inservice training and supportive supervision to help them make the change, pointing out that both their training and their experience had been addressed to the half-day program. They were accustomed to teaching in the shorter format and carrying out similar instructional activities with two sets of children, tailoring to the separate groups as necessary. The longer day required a different kind of planning and, perhaps, a greater repertoire of instructional strategies and materials. They also strongly recommended the assignment of an aide and, where possible, an enrollment of no more than 20 pupils.

How Do Parents React?

Like teachers, parents are divided in their enthusiasm for the change. As many administrators can attest, few parents are neutral on the subject. Some are so adamant that they may threaten to transfer their

children to private schools if an all-day program is not provided. Those who are opposed employ the same threat in the event the district lengthens the session to a full day. The controversy arises from different values, responsibilities, and life styles.

Some parents have become accustomed to the traditional half-day kindergarten and anticipate that schedule happily: they say it allows for quality time with the kindergarten child, while older children continue on in school or babies are napping. Parents may value the child's time at home to play with neighborhood friends and engage in informal learning experiences in the family context. Such parents are likely to fear that a full-day program will bring additional pressure, offer inflexible learning activities, and overstimulate the children, while robbing them of free play opportunities and other activities essential to healthy growth and development.

However, it is the other group of parents -- those who want a full day -- that is growing in number and eagerness. The convinced parents are likely to cite the "readiness" of children for a full-day program. Their children, in most cases, have already been involved in prekindergarten programs, such as nursery school, Head Start, or day care, for one or more years. Often these programs have had a much longer daily session, so that a two and one-half hour program seems an anachronism, perhaps to both parent and child. The convinced parents may also believe that their children could learn more in a longer session.

Parents who believe that all-day kindergarten is an idea whose time has come may be motivated in part by the needs of their total family life. If they are employed, they probably perceive the full-day format as easing the arrangements they must make for after-school child care. In some cases, the full-day program, combined with after-school care, would reduce the number and variety of settings to which a kindergarten child would have to adapt in the course of a day. Parents who have older school-age children might find the logistics of family schedules a little easier.

Regardless of the educational objectives sought in extending to an all-day program, the needs of families will be important influences on whether the program will be attempted, how it will be implemented, and what its outcomes will be.

Most of the research and demonstration programs cited here have collected data on parents' attitudes toward the program, often through preprogram and post-program measures of parents' attitudes. In most cases parents have been positive by the end of the program, even when they were skeptical at the outset. Fears that their children would be unusually tired and pressured have not materialized, and they have found that the adjustment was easier than they anticipated (Alper & Wright, 1979; Gittelman, 1983; Humphrey, 1980, 1983; Winter & Klein, 1970). They have observed their children's progress, and they have been pleased with it.

It is interesting to note that almost all parents are enthusiastic about their children's kindergarten year, whether half-day or all-day. However, a majority of the parents whose children attend a full day would choose that for their children again, while a majority of the parents of children attending half-day sessions would also choose full-day, given the chance (Gittelman, 1983; Humphrey, 1983).

In summary, studies which contrast the effects of daily all-day programs with daily half-day programs are predominantly positive. Children have demonstrated higher achievement, enhanced social-personal abilities, and heightened interest in school. Their parents endorse the longer day, and teachers prefer to teach it. The studies have not reported negative effects from all-day programming. However, several studies cite a need for more research on curriculum, more carefully designed preservice and inservice teacher education, continuing supervisory support, and additional financial support.

CHAPTER V

PLANNING ISSUES

Chapter V specifies critical areas for planning and describes their significance in the program. The seven critical areas are: needs assessment, establishment of aims and objectives, response to children's developmental requirements, parent involvement, the needs of the teaching staff, pupil selection, and resource allocation.

Planning for such a momentous change as extending a half-day program to approximately twice its length or longer requires careful attention to many issues, for example:

- What are the needs of kindergarten pupils and kindergarten teachers? How can they be assessed?
- How can an all-day program be carried out so as to meet the developmental requirements of young children?
- What shall the aims and objectives of the program be?
- What will the staffing requirements be?
- How shall the additional time be used?
- Will the program be available for all kindergarten pupils? If not, how will the pupils be selected for the program?
- What would be the costs of undertaking such a change?

Asking and answering these questions constitute the steps involved in deciding whether such a change is desirable, how it might fill district needs, and what resources it would require.

Assessing Needs

Local boards of education ordinarily consider new programs or program changes when the district's expectations are not being met or when expectations are altered by circumstances. Those circumstances may be related to instruction or to community realities, as we have noted above (pp. 13 -15). To identify and appraise any lack of match between expectations and what is actually taking place, local district personnel should undertake these steps of a needs assessment:

- Review and/or clarify current objectives. What <u>should</u> our pupils gain from the kindergarten experience?
- Examine outcomes from the current program. What are our pupils <u>actually</u> gaining from the kindergarten experience?

- Identify the kind and extent of any discrepancies. In what ways are we failing to meet our objectives for kindergarten education?

- Select the methodology for gathering the data required. How will we know whether the current program is working sufficiently well? (This step involves decisions about the kind of data, the source of the data, and procedures for analysis and interpretation.)

Needs assessment requires time and a variety of other resources. It is important to plan it well and to schedule it carefully, so that the ongoing educational program will not be threatened and the information will be available when needed for making decisions.

Kind of Data. Information about the current status of the program and expectations for it can be collected from as many relevant sources as possible to provide the best basis for the decisions which lie ahead. Some of the data will already be available as a result of normal operating procedures in the schools, for example, from existing evaluation programs and teachers' reports of pupil progress.

Districts which have undertaken needs assessments especially for the purpose of reviewing the kindergarten program have collected the following kinds of data:

- children's preschool backgrounds and kindergarten entry behaviors;

- children's behaviors in situations involving learning tasks, interpersonal relations, and psychomotor activity;

- childrens' energy levels, their motivation for learning, and their attitudes toward school;

- children's progress through the school year and their attainments at the beginning and end of kindergarten and first grade;

- teachers' perceptions of the appropriateness of the existing program and its results, their concerns about pupil needs, their attitudes toward changes; and

- parental attitudes toward the current program and its effects, and their concerns about the current and future educational status of their children.

Sources of Data. Such data may be collected through a variety of instruments and methods, for example:

- parent-teacher interviews and conferences;

- kindergarten registration forms;

- questionnaires and checklists for both teachers and parents;
- observational records and logs, including anecdotes, photographs, audio and video tapes, and children's pictures;
- children's health and attendance records; and
- district program evaluation reports.

Since many persons have a stake in the quality and effectiveness of the kindergarten program, sincere efforts should be made to obtain their views. The kinds of information suggested above should be obtained from:

- pupils in kindergarten, first grade, and perhaps other primary grades;
- kindergarten and primary teachers;
- preschool teachers in the community;
- parents of prekindergarten, kindergarten, and first-grade children; and
- curriculum specialists in district central offices.

Whatever the kind of data and its source, it must be analyzed, interpreted, and reported in a form which permits board members and district personnel to use it for planning. The reports consist of narrative or quantitative summaries, using descriptive and/or inferential statistics.

Aims and Objectives of the Programs

Expectations of kindergartens today are very high, and aims and objectives reflect those values. Yawkey and Silvern (1976) recommend that kindergartens adopt these goals: developing cognitive abilities; building positive self-concepts; strengthening gross-muscle, fine-muscle, and eye-hand coordination; developing social concepts and group participation skills.

The comprehensive nature of such goals helps to explain why persons in many school districts are studying how an all-day schedule might help them to accomplish the essential objectives of the kindergarten year. Kindergarten education is an important and challenging assignment for local school districts.

It is because teachers, administrators, and parents are dissatisfied with what the kindergarten program is accomplishing that they begin to consider changes. Either the current program is not fulfilling the

agreed-upon objectives, or the objectives no longer reflect the desires of the community adequately. Well-planned and well-implemented all-day programs may offer children the time they need to:

- develop competencies which are requisite for success in the kindergarten and in formal learning later;
- acquire an experiential base, which may not be readily available in the home setting, for language, number, physical, and social concepts; and
- engage in social interactions to strengthen language development and foster social-emotional growth.

As an integral part of planning for a longer kindergarten program, it is essential that the objectives for the change be developed, clearly stated, and agreed upon by the adults most closely involved -- kindergarten teachers, primary teachers, administrators, board members, and parents -- all acting upon their intimate knowledge of the children. Those objectives will guide the design of the program, its curriculum and instructional methodology, staffing patterns, pupil selection, and evaluation of the program's effectiveness.

Considering the Developmental Requirements of Young Children

Children of a given chronological age display many similarities in growth and behavior, but they are at the same time quite different individually. It is the nature of most four to six-year-old children to need physical activity, to become frustrated with waiting, to tire after vigorous activity, to have diminished energy levels at some points in the day, to need time in making transitions from one activity or place to another, to become fatigued in prolonged periods of close work, and to need food and fluids in small amounts fairly frequently, with ample time for eating routines (Elkind, 1974; Gesell, Ilg, Ames, & Rodell, 1971). However, the way in which kindergarten pupils demonstrate these tendencies will vary in extent, timing, and intensity. To be effective, programs for five-year-old pupils must be planned and managed with consideration for those normal characteristics.

Significant percentages of children have had experience in full-day child care settings prior to enrolling in kindergarten. Day care centers often have very long sessions, which are planned with the nature of young children in mind. In carefully planned and well-managed programs, children are not adversely affected by a day which matches their parents' work day in length (See discussion on pp. 18-24). However, the secret is in the careful planning and good management of the session and a flexible approach which recognizes the great individual variation among children.

Schools which undertake extended programming must respect the typical physical and emotional requirements of young children, as well as their individual differences. Programs attuned to those needs will avoid overstimulating them, encourage them to use those modes and modalities of

learning most readily available to them, and actively assist them in pacing their activities and attention through the school day. Kindergarten is for all the children, and it should be a positive experience, offering an opportunity for success to all.

Planning the schedule for a full day for five-year-old children requires special attention to the timing and pacing of activities and routines associated with three major areas of development: physical, language and cognitive, and social (Cagnossola, 1977).

Routines Related to Physical Needs. The instructional plan for all-day kindergarten should alternate quiet, stationary activities with more strenuous, vigorous ones. A balance between the two is critical in order to maintain the children's energy levels and interest throughout the longer day. It is only common sense to take our cues from the natural developmental capabilities of children. To do otherwise threatens the best interests of the children themselves and undermines the potential effectiveness of the program. The physical abilities of the children dictate the following considerations in scheduling an all-day program:

- Time in which all children are expected to sit, follow directions closely, and engage in a standard activity for a standard outcome should be sharply limited. This is because such expectations require the child to be quiet and relatively immobile and to await instructions or a turn. Frustration resulting from large amounts of time spent in this way may encourage poor work habits, repress the natural exuberance of young children, and ultimately diminish interest in schoolwork (Cagnossola, 1977, p. 2).

- Young children need ample time for making transitions from one kind of activity to another. Typically, they take longer to wash, attend to toilet needs, dress themselves, and eat. Moreover, the social aspects of engaging in these routines in groups adds distracting elements and may further lengthen the time they need. Knowing these tendencies of young children, kindergarten teachers can reduce the number of routines to be performed in groups and maximize the instructional potential of transition times and routines, for example, with language experiences, songs, and movement. Such planning ensures that the time required by necessary routines is not necessarily "lost" time.

- Teachers may reduce pressure on children to comply with external standards and simultaneously reduce social distractions by flexible approaches to routines where practical. Children may use the toilet room and water fountain as needed, serve themselves a snack individually or in small groups, and so on. This kind of solution to physical needs recognizes the individuality of internal biological rhythms and offers greater opportunity for individual responsibility and independence, while providing the desirable organization and stability of the daily schedule (Cagnossola, 1977).

- The need for rest must receive special attention in the longer day. Often, teachers and parents fear that provisions to handle children's fatigue and their need for rest will make heavy inroads on any additional educational benefits such a program might provide. Experience has shown that fatigue levels are quite manageable after the first few weeks, and many children never display marked fatigue. Because of this variation and because it is well known that children's needs for rest vary in their own home settings (as well as in the newborn nurseries in hospitals!), it is advisable to plan to individualize the resting period.

  Concerns about fatigue in all-day kindergarten are placed in better perspective when teachers and parents remember that, often, children new to a half-day kindergarten are prone to tire and to become over-stimulated in the beginning of the year, just as first graders are. New experiences seem to make physical and psychological demands on all human beings, but especially on young children whose repertoire of familiar experiences is more limited.

  Successful strategies for dealing with children's needs for rest include:

  -- providing a rest period which allows children to sleep or rest quietly, looking at a book, for example;

  -- permitting variation in the length of the rest period for individual children, especially during the first weeks of the school;

  -- phasing in the full-day participation of children who seem to tire easily or whose parents request it; and

  -- beginning with a shorter schedule for all the children and gradually extending it to the full day over the first month or two.

- Lunch is another routine which requires special planning. Eating lunch as a part of a busy, interesting social group may be distracting. Many five-year-olds find it difficult to do two things at once. Therefore, they may forget to eat while they watch, listen, or talk, and thus become hungry in a short time.

  The reduced meal intake of some children adds importance to an afternoon snack of wholesome food.

Teachers have reported that the following strategies have been helpful for handling eating routines in all-day kindergartens:

-- providing space in the classroom for lunch, so that children are not mixed with large numbers of older children, whose size and behavior may seem intimidating;

-- combining the kindergarten children with older children, for example, fifth graders, who can help them and relate in big brotherly and sisterly ways. This can be beneficial to both the younger and the older children.

-- altering expectations for cafeteria behavior for these younger children, in terms of both the time allotted for eating and the amounts of food they are expected to consume. Serving sizes and eating times designed to meet the needs of the oldest elementary school children cannot reasonably be expected to apply to the youngest ones successfully.

Experienced early childhood teachers know ways to foster language and social learnings, extend concepts, and reinforce skills during the routines which are part and parcel of a long school day for young children.

Involving Parents

Research reports on all-day programs and anecdotes shared by personnel in school districts that have considered the change demonstrate conclusively that parents have a stake in these issues and want to exercise their rights. The strong feelings parents bring to the discussion show the intensity of concern they have about the welfare and school success of their children and the respective roles of home and school in the lives of those youngsters.

Parents have the power to make or break an educational innovation of this kind. Their approval will strengthen it, and their disapproval will threaten its effectiveness. Moreover, they can influence the impact of the program on their children, through communicating their enthusiasm or anxiety, through their observations of children's behavior and their interpretations of its causes, and through the accommodations they make and the cooperation they show in the home context. It is, therefore, essential that parents be involved in discussions of a change to all-day programming and that their concerns be handled with openness and respect.

Some of the specific ways school personnel have involved parents are these:

- including them on the committees and task forces which study the possibilities and make recommendations to local boards of education;

- including them in the needs assessment phase of planning;
- surveying their attitudes toward proposed changes of kindergarten scheduling;
- collecting follow-up information on their attitudes after the program has been implemented;
- arranging for flexibility in a child's participation on the basis of strong parental requests, for example, phased-in entry, optional participation, and the like.

Staffing Considerations

The experience of researchers and school personnel with lengthened kindergarten programs shows that particular attention is needed for deciding staffing patterns and for planning staff training. As mentioned in the review of research on teacher attitudes toward full-day programs (pp. 20-22), most kindergarten teachers have been trained to plan for the shorter kindergarten classes, probably teaching two of them in a typical day. Even if they strongly support the extension as a way to improve kindergarten education, they are likely to have some concerns about what the change will mean to their planning and teaching. Advance planning will reassure them about their own abilities to make the change and about the support which they will receive from the district administration. Thus reassured, teachers can undertake the new program with the more positive attitudes which are important to give the program a fair chance.

The following staffing issues should be the focus of careful study during the planning phase:

- Teacher Assignments

  Educational statues (N.J.S.A. 18A:44-3) require that teachers be appropriately certified to teach kindergarten, that is, through the K-6 elementary instructional certificate or the nursery certificate, or endorsement. Contractual agreements between local boards of education and teachers' associations commonly describe the teachers' work and spell out the length of the school day for teachers. These limits will form the framework into which on-site teacher activities necessary for an all-day kindergarten must fit.

- Teaching Load

  Education code provisions restrict the maximum size of kindergarten classes to 25, except for special exemptions (see Appendix B, p.77, for the wording of N.J.A.C. 6:26:2.4). Teachers experienced in all day programs recommend a class size of 20, if possible, or the assignment of a classroom aide, or both, so that the objectives of the longer session can be realized (Herwig & Pinsky, 1982).

- Planning Time

  Duty free periods for planning or lunch are specified in teachers' contracts, and the all-day schedule should be designed with those facts in mind. Teachers need some time away from the children to maintain their own efficiency, to plan for instruction, and to plan cooperatively with other professional and paraprofessional staff. Planning time may be critical to the success of the program.

  Cooperative planning among district teachers is essential in these circumstances: when there are multiple kindergartens, whether all are extended sessions or some remain at two and one-half hours in length; when instructional aides are assigned to the class; and when auxiliary, special teachers (art, music, library, etc.) are involved in the program.

- Teacher Attitudes

  It makes good sense to assign to full-day programs those teachers who are enthusiastic about them or at least open-minded. If a teacher is firmly opposed to a lengthened day and sincerely believes it would not be beneficial to children, it is probable that this prophesy will be self-fulfilling in some way. In such a case, it would be advisable to involve the teacher in visits and interviews, in reviewing the research literature, and in the initial discussions, assuring that she/he is as informed as possible. The additional information may help to neutralize biases and create greater flexibility in attitudes.

- Inservice Training

  For reasons already summarized, teachers need time and consultative resources as they prepare for an all-day program. Although the basic aims of kindergarten education probably will not change, day-to-day objectives will. Teachers will need an opportunity to plan those changes, review existing materials and locate new ones, plan the logistics required by the daily routines of the all-day program, and choose from alternative schedules for teaching-learning activities.

  The inservice training needed should be done prior to the beginning of the program and should be continued at intervals throughout the year of implementation.

- Supervision and Technical Assistance

  As in any innovation, supervision and formative evaluation are necessary to assure that the program is "on course" in its day-to-day quality and projected outcomes. Teachers who have

made the change to full-day schedules strongly recommend that supervisory support and technical assistance be readily available from the central office staff and outside consultants, if need be. Teachers need supervisory support for matters of curriculum and instruction, for scheduling, for the needs of individual children, and for relating to parents.

Pupil Selection Issues

Eligibility for Kindergarten. According to state statutes, once the local board of education elects to establish a kindergarten, it must be available to all five-year-olds residing in the district. (Enrollment at age five, however, is not mandatory, since the compulsory education laws apply beginning at age six years. See Appendix B, p. 77.) When local boards of education decide to extend the length of the basic kindergarten program, they have the responsibility for deciding who shall attend the lengthened sessions. Their decisions are directly related to the objectives of the program.

Teachers, pupils, parents, and administrators all have a stake in issues of pupil selection. Whether the objectives of the program require that pupils be selected for it on the basis of certain criteria, or whether the objective is to strengthen the kindergarten for all pupils, there are critical questions to be answered about selection.

- If it is for <u>all</u> pupils...

  How will the school respond to parents who do not want their children to attend a full day?

  How will the school handle any recommendations of teachers that certain children not be enrolled in an all-day program, at least initially?

- If it is optional...

  How will the school plan for differences between full-day and half-day pupils within the same class?

  How will the core program be planned to meet the requirements of the curriculum code (see Appendix B, p 77-78, for N.J.A.C. 6:26-2.1-2.4)?

- If it is for particular pupils only...

  What procedures will be used to identify them?

  On what basis will these procedures be chosen?

  How will the selection process be explained to teachers and parents?

Flexible Entry Procedures. Some school systems have good results from administering flexible entry procedures, such as gradually lengthening the session to its ultimate duration over a period of several weeks or permitting individual children to phase into the program gradually. Still others allow parents to decide whether or when their children should attend both mornings and afternoons.

Pupil Screening and Assessment. Measurement technology is used throughout our educational system. For example, we use measures of various kinds to help us gauge the status of children in regard to given domains and criteria, to diagnose their problems and identify their strengths, to plan programs for them and select them for certain kinds of interventions, to evaluate their progress, and to assess the worth of their programs in relation to objectives.

Mandates of several programs funded from state or federal funds require that New Jersey pupils be assessed for eligibility for special services and programs, such as bilingual, compensatory, migrant and/or special education. Many of these have impact upon entering kindergarten children. Issues and options in assessment which face local district personnel include the following: who shall be assessed, what should be measured, how shall reliability and validity in instruments be ensured, how shall the assessment be implemented, and how should parents be involved in the process. These issues are critical to the screening and assessment of young children entering any kindergarten, half-day or full-day.

Screening is an initial phase of assessment, usually undertaken to identify those children who may have problems with one or more crucial learning areas. Those who pass through this initial form of assessment without difficulty are expected to succeed in meeting the program expectations. Those who do not pass the screening are identified for a fuller assessment. Through a more thorough study and evaluation, teachers can determine the kind of program most likely to meet their needs and gather information for planning their instruction (Meisels, 1978).

With respect to full-day kindergarten, a screening process is needed if the program is not intended for all students but only for certain ones. For example, the all-day schedule may be addressed to children who are likely to need especially designed educational experiences in order to learn reading in first grade. Screening would result in two groups of children: those who seem to need the specialized program and those who probably do not. Subsequently, more comprehensive assessment would be undertaken for all the pupils as a basis for planning their kindergarten programs.

Pupil assessment should gauge the status of the children in areas fundamental to their learning: cognitive functioning, language facility, perceptual-motor abilities, personal-social development, and health and physical development. Assessment should use multiple indicators, because

there is no valid way to screen children for a program on the basis of only one kind of measure. Multiple measures help to ensure that a representative picture of the child will emerge. Young children's behavior is influenced by environmental factors, and no one way of looking at them can be sufficiently reliable or valid. Nor is it helpful to focus on one area of development, the cognitive, for example, a part from a consideration of others. Information so limited can be misleading.

Costs and Resources

School boards, administrators, and taxpayers are particularly concerned with the cost effectiveness of the program. During the current period of fiscal restraint, factors which increase costs are scrutinized with great care. This is one very important reason for the careful study and planning which district personnel should undertake in connection with the concept of all-day kindergarten.

Experience shows that the expenses of all-day programs, in comparison with the traditional half-day kindergarten, are associated with the following factors:

- changes in bus service;
- projected class sizes and enrollment patterns;
- available supplementary funding;
- teacher assignments;
- start-up costs (i.e., availability of rooms, equipment, and furnishings);
- additional instructional materials; and
- program evaluation design.

Depending on these factors, costs vary among districts, ranging from negligible to relatively high. Some districts may have potential resources to offset the costs. For example, teaching assignments may be altered so as to require little or no additional staffing. Some districts can eliminate a mid-day kindergarten bus route, thus realizing a considerable saving. Expenses for materials and supplies, which are normally modest by comparison with those for other elementary classes, will usually change very little.

In comparing costs of all-day and half-day programs offered five days a week for an entire school year, one study reported that the longer schedule would require 20 percent more money one year and approximately 32 percent more the next. (Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, 1980.) The additional costs were projected on the basis of salary and fringe benefits for teachers, salary for classroom aides, and instructional materials, minus the transportation costs of a midday bus route.

In Hamilton Township, administrators figured the costs of the pilot program according to these categories: personnel, carpeting and furnishings, testing and other items needed for the research and evaluation design, and additional instructional and administrative needs (Gittelman, 1983). To help the local board of education decide whether to extend the all-day schedule, the administrators analyzed the space available and estimated the costs of district-wide implementation. In this process, they were able to specify the impact of the space requirements on all other elementary school programs and to project the costs for any additional furniture, equipment, books and consummable supplies.

When the objective of the extended program is to enrich the pupils' experiences and prevent predicted difficulties in learning basic skills in first grade and beyond, it is possible for eligible schools to use money designated for basic skills improvement. (A description of what is involved in this regard is included in Appendix F, p. 103.)

Assessing initial expenses is not the only way to estimate the cost of an all-day kindergarten program. Cost-effectiveness may be more accurately measured by taking a long-term view. Districts considering longer kindergarten sessions should study the start-up costs of the change and also make provision for assessing the effectiveness of the proposed model, through planning for reasonable objectives, good program management, and summative evaluation. The actual costs of the program changes, both in initial and continuing outlays, may prove to be offset by potential savings if fewer pupils are required to repeat a year of school or are placed in remedial and enrichment programs subsequent to kindergarten. Some studies suggest that such long-range savings are indeed possible (Adcock, Hess, & Mitchell, 1980; Nieman & Gastright, 1981).

CHAPTER VI

TYPICAL COURSE OF ACTION BY LOCAL BOARDS OF EDUCATION

From the time the local board of education becomes interested in the possibility of a longer kindergarten day until its members are prepared to make a decision about it, several steps are necessary. These are summarized in this chapter, which is based upon the actual experience of many communities in New Jersey and elsewhere.

The global question for which local district representatives must find an answer is: What is the best possible scheduling for our kindergarten classes? If the recommended answer is an all-day or extended program, it will be based on the information accumulated in response to the following component issues:

- What educational purposes can be served by extending the length of the kindergarten day?
- What are the practical reasons to do so?
- How should the curriculum content and scope change for an all-day or extended-day program?
- What would be the probable effects on the children, teachers, and parents?
- What additional funding and other resources would be needed?
- Which pupils should attend such a program? How should they be selected?
- How should the program be evaluated?

When local boards of education become interested in an all-day kindergarten, typically they proceed through a series of steps to study the issues and decide on desirable actions. The necessary steps are described briefly in the following pages.

Precipitating Factors

A precipitating factor alerts the board members to the desirability of changing the kindergarten program. The cause of their new interest may be related to the educational status and the needs of children in the district or to practical circumstances. One or more of the following factors is often involved:

- instructional concerns

  Curriculum coordinators, principals, and kindergarten and primary teachers may report that the current time provisions seem inadequate for fulfillment of the kindergarten objectives.

- Conclusions from Program Evaluation

  Analysis of pupil outcomes in kindergarten and first grade may lead to concerns about the current program and desires to consider altering it.

- External Influences

  The board of education may be the target of pressure from parents and community members who want a longer school day at kindergarten level.

Unique circumstances occasionally steer a local board of education and the administrators to initiate a study of all-day kindergarten. For example, a newly-elected board member may assume office with such a program on his/her personal agenda, or an influential school leader may openly advocate the innovation.

Preliminary Board Action

When the request comes to the official attention of the local board of education, the board members are unlikely to be prepared to deal with it immediately. Perceiving their own need for further information, they will probably request the superintendent to identify the component issues, provide them with background data on the current kindergarten and the differences that might be expected from changing it, and develop some recommendations for them to consider.

Establishment of a Study Committee

Most superintendents assign the task to a committee, headed by a principal or a member of the central office staff, although an administrator may occasionally develop such a report and recommendations working alone. A typical district study committee is composed of both educators and lay persons, for example: kindergarten and first grade teachers; a reading specialist and/or curriculum coordinator; a principal and/or assistant superintendent; parents of current, future, and past kindergarten pupils; school board members; and other members of the school community.

The time allowed for the committee's deliberations varies from several months to a full school year, enabling the group to study the concept of the all-day kindergarten in relation to the current kindergarten program, the potential effects of the change on the existing program, and the desirability of establishing an all-day or extended program. The committee will then be in a position to develop its recommendations.

The Committee's Study

In carrying out its responsibilities, the committee must consider the issues in a comprehensive manner. The following questions should be

addressed and their answers used to constitute the content of the committee's report back to the board of education:

- Why is the topic under study in our district?

  This actually constitutes a statement of the problem which has led to the study.

- What are the purposes and accomplishments of the existing program?

  The answers to this question provide a summary description of the current kindergarten program.

- What are the strengths and unmet needs of the current program?

  This optional evaluative statement may also be a part of the statement of the problem.

- What kinds of differences does an all-day kindergarten make?

  The answer is derived from a summary of research on all-day programs.

- What is the experience of other New Jersey schools?

  This calls for visits and interviews in other schools with experience with extended sessions.

- What additional resources would be necessary?

  The answer requires an identification of curricular and administrative requirements and an estimate of the additional costs of staff, facilities, and instructional materials, modified by any savings which can be realized.

- What differences might all-day kindergarten make to our district?

  Conclusions should be drawn about the potential effects of the change within the district. The potential effects perceived will have implications for the objectives of an all-day program, should the board decide in favor of it.

- What is the best course of action, given all the variables?

  The answer constitutes the formulation of recommendations for board action.

  In some study committees, the charge is to recommend alternative strategies for fulfilling refined or newly-defined kindergarten objectives. In these cases, the committees will want to consider the available options and evaluate and compare their potentials for accomplishing the objectives.

Often, the committee is divided into sub-committees for different phases of the work. This enhances the efficiency of the committee as a whole, since some of the phases of the study can be undertaken by a few members without the necessity of all being involved continually. For example, a sub-committee might be responsible for each of these areas: an overview of the existing program; a summary of conclusions of research and demonstration programs; reports on visits and interviews; or any other parts of the planned report to the school board.

The Report and Recommendations

After compiling the data and drawing conclusions from them, the committee members will summarize their findings and formulate their recommendations, in accordance with the deadline set by the board of education at the outset. The committee may recommend that an all-day or extended session be implemented, or that it not be acted upon, or that it be initiated in the form of a pilot study. Because of the variety of factors which may influence the establishment of an all-day kindergarten and because of the diverse circumstances within local New Jersey school districts, committee members may consider it advisable to "try-out" the program in a limited way to test how it works for their own district.

A pilot program may be carried out in one or more designated kindergartens selected from the entire district, or in all the kindergartens of the district for a specified period. Sometimes the program is piloted with certain pupils, selected by their learning characteristics, or by random sampling, or even by random assignment to full and half-day programs. In these latter instances, the evaluation at the end of the pilot test can use comparative data.

Enthusiasm for pilot programs is mixed. Some local districts have had negative experiences with the selection processes involved in pilot programs. Dealing with those has distracted their efforts and attracted negative responses which may be unrelated to a district-wide all-day program (DiFrancesco, 1982).

Action of the Local Board

The local board of education accepts the report and considers the recommendations of the study committee at a public meeting. As indicated earlier, the concept of all-day kindergarten is controversial in many communities, and members of the school community are likely to hold strong feelings one way or the other. Open discussion of the information provided by the study committee and open debate on the merits of their proposals are imperative if the community is to support the ultimate decision made by the board members.

The board must make the policy decision which answers the overall question: Should the district establish an all-day or extended day kindergarten program? If the answer is affirmative, the board must further decide whether to plan for a pilot study or limited trial of the program change or for full implementation. The comprehensiveness of the

committee's report will aid in these additional decisions. If the answer is negative, the board must decide whether to plan for reconsideration of the issues at a later time or for consideration of other options in kindergarten programming, such as extended day, revised curriculum or staff development efforts. (The major steps in the course of action typically taken by local boards of education are summarized in Appendix D, pp. 93.)

Assuming that the local board of education decides to try an all-day kindergarten, there will be an urgent need to plan for the essentials of programming. These will be discussed in Chapter VII.

CHAPTER VII

RESOURCES FOR PROGRAM PLANNING

Subsequent to the decision to establish an all-day kindergarten, a number of programmatic issues must be settled, for example: methods of screening and assessment, content and scope of curriculum, provision for necessary routines, procedures for program evaluation, kind and extent of inservice training and supervisory support. This section of the guide summarizes guiding principles and lists sources of information to aid in making the necessary decisions and plans.

Pupil Screening and Assessment

Many helpful and instructive materials have been developed to help school personnel plan and carry out assessment programs, relating them carefully to the objectives of their instructional programs. Some of these are listed below, pages 46-47. Measurement procedures and instrumentation involving young children and their initial school experiences should be based on several principles, which include the following:

1. There must be a logical connection between what is screened and assessed and the objectives of the educational program.

2. There must be multiple measures, that tap different kinds of behavior, that reflect different domains of development, and that can be applied in different settings.

3. The measures that the child can do must be compatible with the child's developmental status and must permit the child to demonstrate fully his/her capabilities. Paper and pencil or crayon tests are almost always inappropriate as a source of assessment information for young children, preschool through six years of age, and as a primary source of assessment information through the primary grades.

4. The assessment procedures and their purposes should be communicated clearly to parents. Parents have valid information to share about their children's strengths and needs. Therefore, care should be taken to enable them to share that information.

5. The statistical principles of validity and reliability should be respected in the development of the assessment program.

6. Screening and assessment procedures should be evaluated from time to time by comparing initial data and its interpretations with pupils' experiences in the program. Where the preliminary predictions are borne out by the children's attainments and the teachers' reports,

the assessment procedures are validated for the particular program. Where they are not, it is a sign that some changes are necessary to increase their validity.

Resources for Screening and Assessment. The listed materials are sources of information to help district personnel in planning approaches to screening and assessment.

Association for Childhood Education International. (1975) Testing and evaluation. Washington, DC: Author.

This booklet takes the position that measurement of children's status and progress, as well as programs, requires rethinking and experimentation with innovative approaches. In sections which provide an overview of testing and evaluation, the problems and possibilities of testing, and some examples of meaningful evaluation, a number of authorities offer recommendations for integrating measurement into educational aims and practice. All are based on theory and research and have been tried in classrooms with teachers and pupils.

Educational Testing Service. (Current listings). Annotated bibliographies of measures in the Test Collection. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, Test Collection.

The ETS Test Collection has developed a series of annotated listings of measures for specified purposes, for example, measures of readiness, child development, achievement, and so on. Many of the annotated measures may be examined on-site, following arrangements for an appointment. The measures available for examination include the Head Start Test Collection.

Goodwin, W.L., & Driscoll, L.A. (1980). Handbook for measurement and evaluation in early childhood education. San Franscisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

The handbook treats measurement and evaluation in the context of early childhood education. Following discussions of basic concepts of measurement and types of measures, the handbook describes cognitive measures, in the form of intelligence and school-related tests, and in the form of developmental, language, and creativity tests; affective measures; and psychomotor measures. A full chapter deals with observational measurement. Final sections of the book are addressed to evaluation of individuals and programs. The book also contains a list of sources of early childhood measures.

Johnson, O.G. (1976). Tests and measurements in child development: Handbook II. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Focused on measures of child development, the handbook establishes criteria for those chosen for review and presents the measures in these categories: cognition, personality and emotional characteristics,

perceptions of environment, self-concept, qualities of home environment, motor skills and sensory perception, physical attributes, attitudes and interests, social behavior, and others.

Meisels, S.J. (1978). A guide to early childhood developmental screening. Boston, MA: Massachusetts State Department of Education, Division of Special Education, Early Childhood Project.

An overview of specific issues and practical considerations involved in developing and operating a screening program for young children. Although it was written for the specific purpose of providing guidance for the identification of children with special needs and handicapping conditions, this booklet offers essential principles and practical advice for screening for other purposes as well.

Oakland, T. (Ed.) (1977). Psychological and educational assessment of minority children. New York: Brunner/Mazel, Pub.

Based on an assumption that diagnosis is necessarily linked with program planning and implementation, this book offers chapters by a variety of authorities on nondiscriminatory uses of measurement. The chapters are addressed to trends and issues in nonbiased assessment, designing and using diagnostic approaches and intervention programs, and operationalizing assessment and program planning. The appendices contain a variety of position papers, guidelines, legal standards, and an annotated bibliography of language dominance measures.

Ryan, T. F., & Cruz, J. (1974). Assessment: Humanizing decision making. Washington, DC: American Association of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Educators.

This publication is an action-oriented workbook approach to planning for assessment. The booklet places assessment in the context of an educational program. Its contents cover assessment in the early and middle childhood years and assessment in professional life.

Curriculum Content and Scope

According to the New Jersey Administrative Code, N.J.A.C. 6:26-2.1-2.4 (see Appendix B. pp. 76), the core kindergarten program should be balanced and should take place in appropriate facilities, with adequate equipment, materials, and supplies. Instruction in subject areas, such as reading, should be planned by the teacher on the basis of observations of individual children. Those very general program guidelines give local school districts wide latitude in offering instruction which meets both the needs of the children and the expectations of the local community.

These same guidelines prevail in all-day programs. The objectives of any kindergarten program should be based on sound principles of child growth and development, whatever the current urgent concerns and trends in education may be. As noted, the recent emphasis on basic skills, often

narrowly conceived, may have jeopardized the regular inclusion of the very activities through which young children develop and strengthen concepts and skills most readily. Lengthening the school day for five-year-olds should ensure that the goals and objectives of the program are realized.

The increased time should help the teacher tailor the instruction for individual pupils and provide for horizontal enrichment of children's educational experiences. The purpose of the full-day program is not to accelerate formal academic learning, with the expectation that children can move through the curriculum faster -- at "double time." The instructional program should be addressed to a continuity of learning among the experiences before, during, and following kindergarten. A clear imperative of program planning is to base the curriculum on adequate knowledge of the child's status, background, and the future expectations he/she faces, so that optimal and continual growth are facilitated.

A move to establish an all-day kindergarten provides a compelling reason to examine the current curriculum. Educational personnel will want to assure that the additional time will be used for appropriate teaching and learning, for fulfilling the educational objectives of the all-day kindergarten, and for meeting the learning needs of the children who will participate. It is important to note that many school systems which institute all-day programs do not simultaneously change the content and scope of their curricula. Most often, this is because they perceive the extended sessions as a more effective way to do what they are already attempting to do.

Goals of a particular local district's kindergarten will have been developed in relation to a philosophy, which is based on assumptions about the purposes of education, the nature of children as learners, and the responsibilities of the persons who teach them. The New Jersey State Board of Education adopted in 1979 and reaffirmed in 1983 a Statement of Philosophy and Principles for Early Childhood Education (shown in Appendix A, p. 70.) This broad statement is an example of how local districts might articulate shared beliefs and values for the education of their youngest pupils. The local district statement for the kindergarten will be derived from the overall educational philosophy, developed consensually through the cooperation of teachers, administrators, parents, and community representatives. Goals developed from the philosophic position described are characterized by their breadth and generality and the necessity for sufficient time to realize them.

Educational objectives associated with such goals are more specific. They lend themselves to assessment, and they can be achieved in a shorter time. Objectives make the educational goals operational; that is, they specify how we will know that milestones on the way to the goal are being attained.

Broadly conceived, a curriculum identifies the skills, facts, concepts, and attitudes children should acquire and when they should do so. Elkind (1976) has identified three separate sources of the curriculum as follows:

- the school curriculum -- what the society insists that children must learn;
- the developmental curriculum -- the learning priorities determined by children's levels of growth and development; and
- the personal curriculum -- the learning priorities determined by differences among individual children.

Resources for Curriculum Planning. The many resources available for curriculum planning are most useful after a thorough study of the current status, needs, and ambitions of local districts. Although information gathered on the local level will prove most essential in the final plan, publications, such as those annotated below, can materially assist local district personnel in developing a curriculum appropriate for the specific local needs:

Copple, C., Sigel, I.E., & Saunders, R. (1979). Educating the young thinker. New York: Van Nostrand Co.

Presenting a particular approach to early childhood education, this book provides an underlying set of assumptions about children's cognitive growth. chapters on the following content areas offer suggestions for planning and carrying out instructional strategies: art and construction, music and movement, science, the social-affective domain, and imaginative play.

Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation. (1983). Full-Day kindergarten handbook. Evansville, IN: Author.

The handbook is a looseleaf ring binder with practical suggestions, lists, and examples in these categories: equipment, facilities, and materials; management; instruction and evaluation. The handbook includes principles of learning and development, curricular sequencing, suggested instructional activities, sample schedules, and lists of appropriate books and materials.

Frierson, F., & Hills, T.W. (1982). Planning an educational program for young children. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey State Department of Education, Division of School Programs.

This brief guide summarizes generic steps involved in planning an educational program for young children, preschool through early primary grades. The booklet is one of a series of planning guides, all hole-punched for use in a looseleaf notebook. The appendix includes an annotated list of references for additional assistance.

Hawaii State Department of Education. (1972) A curriculum guide for early childhood education. Honolulu, HI: Author, Office of Instructional Services.

The guide, in the form of a looseleaf ring binder, offers a comprehensive overview of curriculum for children, three to eight years, with emphasis on three- to five-year-olds. There are sections on philosophy, goals and objectives, theories and models of curriculum, teaching strategies, classroom environment, evaluation, parent involvement, and curriculum in typical content areas.

Iowa State Department of Public Instruction. (1983). Kindergarten...A year of beginnings. Des Moines, IA: Author.

This publication shows how curriculum and instruction are constructed around goals and objectives related to cognitive, affective, social, and psychomotor development. The booklet calls for a new, updated approach to kindergarten education, one which will involve learning experiences designed to ensure that children use their intellectual abilities, grow in the use of language, and develop basic concepts as foundations for later learning.

Margolin, E. (1976) Young children -- Their curriculum and learning processes. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Written for those who plan to teach in early childhood programs for children up to the age of eight years, this book discusses types of programs, principles of child development and their implications, curriculum planning and conceptual frameworks for curriculum development. In other chapters devoted to communication skills, social studies, mathematics, science and aesthetic expression, the book presents information about relationships between teachers and parents and schools and communities.

New Jersey Association of Kindergarten Educators. (1977). The kindergarten and early years of school. Trenton, NJ: NJAKE, in cooperation with the New Jersey State Department of Education.

Described as a guide for teachers of children four, five, six and seven years of age, the booklet is organized by goals, and foundations for learning, children and their learning, the curriculum, the learning environment, human resources, perspectives on evaluation, and parent-teacher relationships. Examples of appropriate teaching approaches and principles for planning are included in each section.

Oklahoma State Department of Education. (1982) Beginnings . . . Early childhood education in Oklahoma. Oklahoma City, OK: Author.

This booklet is a source book for curriculum development for prekindergarten, kindergarten, and primary grades. There are sections on developmental characteristics, creating a learning environment, planning for instruction, and developing learning activities for content areas within an integrated curriculum.

Seefeldt, C. (Ed.) (1976). Curriculum for the Preschool-Primary Child. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

The book contains information on curriculum theory and instructional practices in nine learning areas, as follows: language, reading, social studies, science, mathematics, art, music, play, and movement. There are guidelines for selecting teaching strategies and learning activities.

Selection of Learning Activities

Learning activities are selected or designed to implement goals and objectives of the overall curriculum. As in any kindergarten, they must provide the variety which maintains pupil interest and enables young children to respond in ways which reflect their strengths and meet their learning needs. The all-day schedule can provide for variations in pace, focus, content, and context to keep children's interest high, accommodate to their most efficient learning modalities, and assure fulfillment of expectations.

At its most basic level, the selection of learning activities must be based upon several principles that are widely believed to underlie the development and learning of young children. These four prinicples have been derived from a synthesis of the theories and research of eminent developmental psychologists of contemporary times (Roedell, Jackson, & Robinson, 1980):

- Children are by nature eager learners who learn best when there is a good match between their prior experiences, their present level of understanding, and the new concept or event.

- Children learn most efficiently when they participate actively, either mentally or physically, in the learning activities. They have a spontaneous interest in exploring situations, manipulating concrete materials, experimenting with new objects, and expressing their thoughts in language, sociodramatic play, art media, music, movement, and all manner of other symbolic activities.

- Children are more likely to behave as teachers want them to if they are themselves interested in the behaviors, if they like what happens as a result, and/or if the behaviors are compatible with what they observe in adults and other children whom they know and like.

- Children learn skills and acquire ideas from interacting with other children -- observing them, communicating with them, sharing materials and the like. Interaction with peers can provide a context for exploring thoughts and actions, with less risk of feeling embarrassed or inadequate than is often the case in interaction with adults, teachers, for example.

One pervasive theme in kindergarten instruction is represented by "readiness" activities. Evans (1975) offers a four-part conception of readiness which teachers may use as a criterion for planning and selecting kindergarten learning activities:

- Task Analysis. What is required of the children in order for them to engage in or master what the teacher plans to teach?
- Assessment. What relevant skill and knowledge do the children currently have at their command?
- Motivation. What is the level of interest the children have in attending to this task and persisting in it?
- Economy. Can the children learn the task efficiently at this time?

In recent years, the public has exerted pressure on schools to accelerate the beginning of formal instruction in academic subjects, particularly reading, despite the fact that we have no research evidence that such early efforts make for positive lasting differences among pupils. In fact, many authorities worry that it may be damaging to require young children to attempt formal readiness exercises and reading itself, before they have the prerequisite experiential basis and the underlying cognitive processes (Hoffman & Fillmer, 1979; Ringler & Weber, 1984; Waller, 1977). There are concerns that early "forcing" may predispose children to failure, thus damaging their potential sense of confidence and mastery and causing them to feel apathy or distaste for reading. "Focusing" may also rob children of time in which they might have succeeded in problem-solving, functional language, and concept building (Dechant & Smith, 1977; Elkind, 1982).

The key appears to be understanding and respect for the nature of their learning. By ignoring the ways young children think and learn teachers and parents can push them prematurely into formal education which is meaningless to them. With reading and other essential tool subjects, we have a critical dual responsibility: to teach children how but also to teach them to want to learn.

Resources for Selecting Learning Activities.

The materials annotated below are representative of sources of a wide variety of learning activities which can help curriculum supervisors and teachers plan for educational experiences through which children may learn effectively and happily.

Cain, S.E., & Evans, J.M. (1984). Sciencing: An involvement approach to elementary science methods, 2nd Ed. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

This book is designed to help teachers, either preservice or inservice, gain the background knowledge necessary to teach elementary science. In one chapter on instructional materials, readers are encouraged to analyze

and compare the well-known science curricula. Many suggestions are offered to encourage teachers to try out scientific experiments, in preparation for using them or others with pupils.

Copeland, R.W. (1974). How children learn mathematics (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

The book presents an overview of the orderly development of the intellectual abilities and processes which make it possible for children to acquire knowledge of mathematics. Based on the theories and research of Jean Piaget, the book describes the typical learning strategies of children and makes recommendations for effective teaching.

Copeland, R.W. (1982). Mathematics and the Elementary Teacher (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

In contrast with the Copeland book cited immediately above, this one applies methods of teaching to mathematics more broadly. Although it is based on the work of Piaget and a number of psychologists, it emphasizes the mathematics which teachers typically teach in elementary school, rather than theory and research.

Hammill, D.D. & Bartel, N.R. (1982). Teaching children with learning and behavior problems, 3rd Ed. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

This book contains chapters on teaching children with special needs in the areas of reading, writing, spelling, handwriting, and mathematics. There are also chapters on classroom management and assessment, as well as principles for the selection of educational materials and resources.

Kamii, C. & DeVries, R. (1976). Piaget, children, and number. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

This is a small, paperback booklet which applies Piaget's theory to teaching quantitative concepts to young children. Based on cognitive developmental approaches, it presents a variety of learning experiences which can help children to deepen their understandings and extend their knowledge of number.

Ollila, L. O. (Ed.) (1977). The kindergarten child and reading. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Contributors to this brief paperback volume include Dolores Durkin, Dorothy Strickland, Bernice Cullinan, Walter MacGinitie, and others. The booklet offers facts about pre-first grade reading, readiness, the role of the teacher, organizing the schedule for individual instruction, and the function of kindergarten reading materials.

Pagano, A. L.K. (Ed.) (1978). Social studies in early childhood: An interactionist point of view. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Presenting social studies at the center of the curriculum, as a way of integrating all the curricular strands, the writers stress that children's development is greatly influenced by the society in which they live within a society and that social studies content is derived from a variety of social science disciplines. The book describes children learning through active participation in making decisions and solving problems in appropriate social studies activities.

Smith, C.A. (1982). Promoting the social development of young children: Strategies and activities. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

From an orientation in developmental theory, the book offers more than 100 learning activities through which young children may grow in awareness of themselves and others, gain in accepting and understanding feelings, learn about their social world, and develop their abilities to resolve conflicts and cooperate with others more fully.

Spache, E.B. (1976). Reading activities for child involvement (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Among the chapters contained in this book are several which can be used by kindergarten teachers who are seeking activities to help children acquire prereading skills. Each section states a rationale, which is followed by a listing of learning activities through which children may practice skills requisite to reading.

Weikart, D. P., Rogers, L., Adcock, C., & McClelland, D. (1971). The cognitively oriented curriculum. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, ERIC/NAEYC.

Following an introduction to theories of cognitive development, the book discusses the nature of teaching in a cognitively oriented program as well as relationships with parents to help ensure the effectiveness of the program. The remainder of the book is composed of an activity guide to help teachers provide instructional activities through which children can gain knowledge of the physical world and logico-mathematical thinking (i.e., classification, seriation, etc.). Sample lesson plans and schedules are provided, together with suggestions for teacher planning.

Planning the Schedule

Most kindergarten teachers have had ample experience in developing and operating by a schedule for a half-day program. For such teachers, planning the schedule for all-day kindergarten may be a real challenge. In addition to allowing more time for the familiar areas of instruction, teachers will need to mesh their classroom schedules with those of any special teachers, such as art, music, and physical education, and allow for the routines pupils will need to carry out in the longer day.

Good instructional management includes recognition of the personal agendas of pupils, which emphasize their physical and psychological

needs. Unless these receive appropriate attention from teachers, the teachers' agendas are in jeopardy. In all-day programs for young children, such needs include the following:

- adequate provision for individual needs for eating, drinking and toileting;
- time and space for resting or napping;
- alternation between quiet and active involvement and group and individual activities; and
- allowance for the time required to make the transition from one kind of activity to another.

Sample Schedules. Scheduling becomes critically important to effective programs.

The sample schedules shown below illustrates ways in which individual and group needs may be accommodated in an all-day program. As shown, teachers must make provisions for the needs cited, while simultaneously fulfilling the educational objectives. These responsibilities require a careful plan and equally careful implementation.

All-Day Kindergarten
Sample Plan A

8:30 a.m. - 2:45 p.m. daily

8:30 - 8:50	Opening Exercises
8:50 - 9:30	Teacher-Directed Activity
9:30 - 11:15	Work-Play (Choice of activities plus group work)
11:15 - 12:00	Lunch; Rest
12:00 - 12:30	Music and Rhythms
12:30 - 1:15	Language Activities (less structured, e.g. puppets, dramatics, etc.)
1:15 - 2:00	Outdoor Play and Physical Education
2:00 - 2:45	Stories and Related Activity; Dismissal

The schedule may vary day-to-day.

(Cincinnati, Ohio Public Schools, 1974).

All-Day Kindergarten
Sample Plan B

8:45 a.m. - 2:40 p.m. daily

8:45 - 9:00	Organizational Time - Record Keeping
9:00 - 9:35	Reading Readiness
9:35 - 10:10	Independent Activities (for eye-hand coordination, visual discrimination, etc.)
10:10 - 10:40	Language; Auditory Discrimination; General Concept Development
10:40 - 11:10	Special Learning Activities (Art, Music, Physical Education, Library)
11:10 - 11:50	Lunch
11:50 - 12:20	Gross Motor Activities
12:20 - 12:50	Math Activities
12:50 - 1:50	Language Expression and Development
1:50 - 2:20	Science, Social Studies, Health and/or Nutrition
2:20 - 2:40	Literature Appreciation

from Lawrence Township, New Jersey (R. Graja, 1983).

All-Day Kindergarten
Sample Plan C

9:45 a.m. - 3:00 p.m. daily

8:45 - 9:00	Opening Exercises
9:00 - 9:30	Math
9:30 - 9:45	Rhythms
9:45 - 10:15	Reading Skill Groups (with reading specialists and resource room, if applicable, as well as teacher)
10:15 - 11:00	Snack and Play
11:00 - 11:30	Story, Language Development Activity
11:30 - 12:15	Lunch and Outdoor Play
12:15 - 12:30	Rest
12:30 - 1:15	Learning Center Activities, Social Studies, Science
1:15 - 1:45	Creative Expression
1:45 - 2:25	Special Learning Activities (Art, Music, Physical Education, Library, etc.)
2:25 - 2:50	Closing Exercises

from Green Brook, New Jersey (Moskowitz & Brainum, 1983)

Comparison of Half and Full-Day Schedules. Many local boards of education hear from the parents and teachers who question whether an all-day program will actually allow for significantly increased instructional time, precisely because of the necessity to provide for the physical and psychological needs of young children. Therefore, it is helpful to analyze the basic daily plans of representative half-day and all-day programs to compare and contrast what takes place. The following comparisons have been reported:

Activities and Routines	Half-day	All-Day
Basic instructional time with kindergarten teacher	100 minutes	220 minutes
Miscellaneous (opening and closing exercises, administrative routines)	15 minutes	20 minutes
Snack and Rest	20 minutes	15 minutes
Clean up; Preparation for Dismissal	15 minutes	15 minutes
Lunch; Free Play, Rest (with aide)	0 minutes	90 minutes
Learning Reinforcement Activities with Aide (under supervision of teacher)	0 minutes	30 minutes
TOTAL PER DAY*	150 minutes	390 minutes

Time Utilization in Two Types of Schedules

Type	Total Min. Per Wk.	Instructional Time	Noninstructional Time	Percent of Instructional
Half-day daily	895	720	175	80.5%
All-day	from 1900 to 1975	1150 1125	750 850	60.5% 57 %

(Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, 1980)

*Weekly schedule includes 95-100 minutes of special classes, such as Art, Music, Physical Education, Library, and Guidance. Comparison from Hamilton Township Schools, New Jersey. (Gittelman, 1982).)

Resources for Planning Schedules. In addition to these samples, many others are included in the research reports cited and in the additional sources suggested in the resources for further study of curriculum and selection of learning activities. Also, teachers may wish to consult one of the following publications:

Connecticut Early Childhood Education Council. (1983). Report on full-day kindergarten. Wilton, CT: Author.

In addition to general information about full-day kindergartens, the booklet presents ideas for implementing a full-day program, meeting individual needs through the daily schedule and developing the basic schedules. Sample schedules illustrate the points.

High/Scope Educational Research Foundation. (1975). Teacher's guide to the daily routine. Ypsilanti, MI: Author.

In "how-to" form, this brief softcover booklet presents the principles of daily routines and the important parts of the school day, with concrete assistance to the reader in how to set up the daily routine. Ways to help children learn through the various parts of the daily routine are then considered, along with sample planning forms for children and sample plans and evaluations for teachers.

Program Evaluation

Evaluation is a process of generating useful and timely information for decisions about a program (Anderson, Ball, & Murphy, 1975). It involves human judgment, on the basis of multiple variables, and it must meet appropriate criteria of objectivity, reliability, validity, practicality, utility, and ethics.

The following are three basic kinds of program evaluation (Ball, 1979):

- Needs Assessment. A part of program evaluation which is used to help make decisions concerning whether to develop a program. It takes place before a program is developed; it identifies needs and sets priorities. (Needs assessment has been discussed above, pp. 45.)

- Formative Evaluation. It is a part of program evaluation used to help make decisions about how best to develop a program. It takes place during the development or pilot testing of a program.

- Summative Evaluation. This is a part of evaluation used to help make decisions about whether to continue as it is or modify an existing program. It takes place after the program is in operation.

Ball (1979) further describes the sequential phases of program evaluation as these: setting goals, selecting measures, applying the measures in the actual setting, analyzing the data, and interpreting the findings.

When local boards of education decide to give all-day kindergarten a trial in the community, they may set a time limit for it. At the end of that period, they may want to see findings and conclusions about whether the program has met its objectives, whether there are any unfortunate or unexpected effects, and how cost-effective the program is. Those who make educational decisions must continually confront choices which are influenced by the scarcity of resources. Thus the economic implications of the program become very important, and members of local boards of education must look for evidence that educational programs are effective and worth the money they cost.

Several of the studies of all-day kindergarten cited in this resource guide have employed comprehensive program evaluation procedures (e.g., Gittelman, 1983; Humphrey, 1983). The information thus generated has enabled the local boards of education to decide whether to continue the program and, if so, whether to maintain its current form or modify it. These studies are excellent sources of information about the overall plan for evaluation, selection of procedures and instruments, and the analysis and interpretation of the data.

Resources for Program Evaluation. In addition, the following readings may provide valuable suggestions for evaluating programs:

Association for Childhood Education International. (1975). Testing and evaluation. Washington, D.C.: Author.
See annotation on page 46 above.

Bloom, B. S., Hastings, J.T., & Madaus, G. F. (197) Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Part I of this book discusses education and evaluation and the use of evaluation methodology for instructional decisions. Evaluation approaches for both cognitive and affective objectives are considered. Part 2 demonstrates the application of principles and strategies of evaluation to particular kinds of educational objectives, such as pre-school education, language arts, science, literature, writing, and various other subjects at secondary school level.

California State Department of Education. (1977). Program evaluator's guide. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

This publication, developed as part of The Evaluation Improvement Program of the California State Department of Education, can serve as a handbook to program evaluation. Its contents cover the following: purposes and requirements of evaluation; development of a plan and an evaluation design, including instrumentation; collection and analysis of data; report of results; application of findings, and a selected bibliography.

Messick, S. & Barrows, T. S. (1972). Strategies for research and evaluation in early childhood education. In I. J. Gordon (Ed.). Early Childhood Education, 71st Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

The authors present a view of evaluation as a process for gathering information about all the facets of an educational program and drawing conclusions about its worth. The characteristics of young children are given full attention, and a case is made for special approaches to evaluating their programs.

Weinberg, R. A., & Moore, S. G. (Eds.). (1975). Evaluation of educational programs for young children. Washington, DC: The Child Development Associate Consortium.

In a series of articles by various authorities, the unique problems associated with evaluating early childhood programs are considered. There are articles on understanding intellectual processes in young children; planning evaluation studies; evaluation of educational programs, with the particular difficulties associated with early childhood education; and validity in measuring educational outcomes in young children.

Inservice Training and Supervisory Support

Planning for the supervision and inservice training of teachers should be based on both general principles of learning and the particular characteristics of adult learning. Some of the fundamentals are these:

- Teachers who have taught only half-day kindergarten face a new and challenging assignment when they are transferred to a full-day program. They need a chance to analyze the situation--to anticipate how things will change; assess the ways in which their existing knowledge and skills will apply; assess the facilities, equipment, and materials they now have; and begin to identify what new knowledge and resources they require.

- Inservice training should be aligned carefully with the needs teachers and assistants perceive. The relevance of the content and form to their teaching experiences will determine the success of the training and affect the quality of the kindergarten program.

- The training sessions should be problem-oriented and offer teachers opportunities for problem solving. For example, a very effective kind of inservice training is that which takes place among teachers while they wrestle cooperatively with a task like rewriting the curriculum.

- Inservice training should require teachers to be active in trying new instructional strategies, both in practice in the workshops and in the classroom with their own pupils. Teachers can benefit from experimenting and reporting outcomes to the training staff, and the supervisors and trainees can benefit from the feedback.

Teachers of all-day kindergartens were asked what would have helped to enhance their competence and confidence in the new assignment (Herwig & Pinsky, 1982). Their list included: administrative support for planning and preparation; visits to all-day kindergartens and discussions with teachers of such programs; and inservice training to prepare for the change and to provide support during the first years of the assignment. They also recommended that college-based teacher training be redesigned to include coursework to accustom preservice teachers to planning for the all-day kindergarten.

The teachers were specific about what they needed from inservice training. They asked for updated information about curriculum and scheduling, guidelines for instructional practice in the all-day program, and new ideas for learning activities. They recommended that these topics be presented in a variety of formats -- college courses, inservice workshops, learning resource centers, television programs, and consultation with specialists.

Resources for Inservice Training and Supervision. The resources listed elsewhere in this chapter may help with planning for inservice training needs. This is especially the case with materials on curriculum, learning activities, and scheduling. Some additional references are given below, together with brief descriptions of their content and use.

Frierson, F., & Hills, T. W. (1981). Planning for parental involvement in early childhood education. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey State Department of Education.

Designed as a guide for teachers and administrators of preschool through early primary grades, the booklet offers suggestions for cooperation between school and home. It describes the necessary steps in systematic planning for varied and responsible parent involvement, giving examples and providing a resource list for additional information.

Glicksman, K., & Hills, T. (1981). Easing the child's transition between home, child care center, and school. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey State Department of Education.

The booklet was developed for the purposes of helping teachers in kindergartens and child care centers communicate with each other about their separate programs so that educational continuity for the children will be facilitated. The contents provide information about the variety of preschool programs, the unique role of kindergarten, steps to make communication and cooperation easier, and the benefits children may experience as a result.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1982). Early childhood teacher education guidelines. Washington, DC: Author.

The publication presents the guidelines developed and endorsed for teachers of young children up to the age of 8 years. Intended as a set of standards for four- or five-year teacher training programs, the guidelines may be used as a checklist to help administrators and supervisors develop ideas for inservice training activities and consultative approaches.

REFERENCES

Adcock, E.P., Hess, J.M., & Mitchell, E.R. (1980). A comparison of half-day and full-day kindergarten on academic achievement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 194 205.)

Alper, C.L., & Wright, D.L. (1979). Extended day kindergarten plus parent involvement: A combination that works, Phi Delta Kappan, 61, 68.

Anderson, S., Ball, S., & Murphy, R. T. (1975). Encyclopedia of educational evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ary, D., & Jacobs, L. C. (1976). Introduction to statistics: Purposes and procedures. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Ball, S.J. (1979). Evaluating educational programs. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Beckner, T.L., Harner, C.H., Kipps, D.M., McCullough, M.S., Trippe, S.J., Williams, M.Z., & Wilson, E.H. (1978). A study of the relationship of kindergarten class size, length, and scheduling of the kindergarten day and teacher self-concept to school success. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 165 891).

Barbe, W.B., Milone, M.N., Lucas, V.H., & Humphrey, J.W. (1980). Basic skills in kindergarten: Foundations for formal learning. Columbus, OH: Zaner-Bloser.

Cagnossola, F. (1977). Areas of concern in scheduling. Unpublished paper. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey State Department of Education.

Chrovinsky, M. (1982). Preprimary enrollment, 1980. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Cleminshaw, H.K. & Guidubaldi, J. (1969). The effects of time and structure on kindergarten student social and academic performance, Journal of Educational Research, 32 (2), 93-99.

Cohen, D.H., & Rudolph, M. (1977). Kindergarten and early schooling. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Dechant, E., & Smith, H. (1977). Psychology in teaching reading. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

DiFrancesco, R. (1982). Full day kindergarten. Unpublished paper. Scotch Plains - Fanwood, NJ.

Elkind, D. (1974). A sympathetic understanding of the child: Birth to sixteen: Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Elkind, D. (1976). Child development and education. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elkind, D. (1982). The hurried child: Growing up too fast too soon. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Evans, E.D. (1975). Contemporary influences in early childhood education (2nd ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Gesell, A., Ilg, F.L., Ames, L.B., & Rodell, J.L. (1971). The infant and child in the culture of today. (rev. ed.). New York: Harper & Row

Gittelman, V. (1982). Interim report of the full-day kindergarten pilot program committee. Hamilton Township, NJ: Hamilton Township Schools, Department of Elementary Education.

Gittelman, V. (1983). Full scale evaluation of the full-day kindergarten pilot program. Hamilton Township, NJ: Hamilton Township Schools, Department of Elementary Education.

Graja, R. (1983). Packet of information on full-day kindergarten. Lawrenceville, NJ: Lawrence Township Schools, Benjamin Franklin School.

Herwig, J.E., & Pinsky, D. (1982). Full-day kindergarten: What do teachers think about it? A paper presented to the Annual Conference of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Washington, D.C.

Hills, T. W. (1984). Dimensions of beliefs and values of kindergarten teachers, nursery teachers, and mothers pertaining to children entering kindergarten. Doctoral Dissertation, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ.

Hoffman, S., & Fillmer, H.T. (1979) Thought, language and reading readiness, The Reading Teacher, 33(3). 290-294.

Humphrey, J. (1980). A study of the effectiveness of full-day kindergarten programs. Evansville, IN: Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation.

Humphrey, J. (1983). A longitudinal study of the effectiveness of full-day kindergarten. Evansville, IN: Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation.

Lacayo, R. (October 8, 1984). Getting off to a quick start. Time Magazine, 124(40), 62.

McClinton, S.L., & Topping, C. (1981). Extended day kindergarten: Are the differences intangible? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 211 199.)

Meisels, S. J. (1978). A guide to early childhood developmental screening. Boston, MA: Massachusetts State Department of Education, Division of Special Education, Early Childhood Project.

Moskowitz, H. & Brainum, IXI. (c 1983). A curriculum guide for full-day kindergarten. Green Brook, NJ: Green Brook School District.

Neiman, R.H., & Gastright, J.F. (1981). The long term effects of ESEA Title I preschool and all day kindergarten: An eight year follow-up study. Cincinnati: Cincinnati Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 198 949.)

New Jersey Association of Kindergarten Educators. (1982). Kindergarten position paper. Trenton, NJ: Author

New Jersey State Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. (1880). Annual report, 1879-80. Camden, NJ: Sinnickson Chew, State Printer.

New Jersey State Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. (1904). Annual report, 1903, Trenton, NJ: MacCrellish & Quigley, State Printers.

Ringler, L.H., & Weber, C.K. (1984). A language-thinking approach to reading. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.

Roedell, W.C., Jackson, N. E., & Robinson, H. B. (1980). Gifted Young Children. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Ross, E. D. (1976). The kindergarten crusade: The establishment of preschool education in the United States. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.

Rosser, D.S. (1971). 100 Years of Free Public Education in New Jersey. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey Education Association.

Spodek, B. (1977). Curriculum construction in early childhood education. Chapter 8 in B. Spodek & H. J. Walberg (Eds.). Early Childhood Education -- Issues and Insights. New York: McCuthan.

Waller, T. G. (1977). Think first, read later? Piagetian prerequisities for reading. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Weber, Evelyn. (1969). The kindergarten: Its encounter with educational thought in America. New York: Teachers College Press.

West, R.L. (1964). Elementary education in New Jersey: A history. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

Whipple, G. M. (1929). Preschool and parental education. 28th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Bloomington, IL.: Public School Publishing Co.

Winter, M., & Klein, A.E. (1970). Extending the kindergarten day: Does it make a difference in the achievement of educationally advantaged and disadvantaged pupils? Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.

(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 087 534.)

Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction. (1980). A comprehension study of three types of kindergarten programs. Final report. Madison: Author.

(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 201 384.

Yawkey, T.D., & Sullvern, S.B. (1976). Kindergarten goals and contemporary education. The Elementary School Journal, 77(1), 24-32.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A.
Principles and Philosophy of Early
Childhood Education,
New Jersey State Board of Education

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

STATEMENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Principles of Early Childhood Education

. . . Individual children are unique, although the processes of development are universal.

. . . Development is continuous. At any given time, the state of development implies that there are limits on the interests and abilities of children.

. . . Learning is an active process. It is natural for young children to be eager learners, active both mentally and physically.

. . . The child is a member of the family. Early childhood education complements family life. Parents have a stake in the education of children. Positive involvement of parents can enhance children's educational experiences.

. . . Early educational experiences can serve to strengthen and enrich a young child's current status, preventing or reducing a need for subsequent remediation.

. . . It is urgent to match educational efforts with the developmental readiness of children.

. . . Programs should be responsive to the needs of young children. Assessment is for purposes of program planning, rather than for child placement.

. . . The role of the teacher is of critical importance. Teachers give practical effect to the educational intent. They bring together the program and the child.

. . . Early childhood programs must reflect the plural nature of our society and the ethnic and language diversity in our state.

. . . It is the role of the State Board, working through the State Department of Education, to set policy for early childhood education. This role cannot be abrogated to funding sources.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

A Statement of Philosophy

The goal of early childhood education is to involve young children in an educational process which enhances their childhood experiences and which, continued throughout their childhood and youth, will help them to become responsible adults.

The educational process affects human beings in many ways: intellectual development, personality formation, social relationships, expression through the arts, and physical growth and development. There are a variety of influences in the educational process. At no time is this more evident than during the period of early childhood. The family provides the first and most lasting effects. Schools contribute the longest and most continuous influence outside the home. A number of other agencies and institutions also have valid interests in the socialization of children and in their development and welfare. Cooperation between all concerned parties is essential to the best possible growth, development, and learning of young children.

Planning educational programs for young children and providing leadership in their development and operation are responsibilities of the educational system. Schools have a unique role in the education of children. In addition to basic skills and knowledge, schools teach children about themselves and others, about their communities, about citizenship, and about work. Effective early childhood education should assist all enrolled children to attain subsequent school success, even as it helps each child reach his or her potential intellectually, socially, physically, and emotionally.

Young children are eager and curious learners, endowed by nature with a spontaneous interest in exploring, inquiring, and experimenting. Play is one of the distinctive ways in which young children attempt to make sense of their experiences. Along with language and other symbolic activities, imaginative play provides a necessary way for young children to observe events, interact with persons and objects, and develop understanding. Programs of early childhood education should provide a curriculum with a combination of concrete learning experience, adult assistance, and time appropriate to the developmental levels of the children.

The acquisition of certain academic skills and understandings is determined by natural patterns of maturing and by previous experience matched to new experience. The workable mix cannot be achieved by undue emphasis on any one of the factors. Just as there is no point in teaching children what they

already know, it is futile to attempt to teach them what they are as yet unable to do. It is essential to design programs which reflect our knowledge of the growth patterns of young children and to observe and respect individual differences within those patterns. Assessment of children's strengths and needs can contribute to the development of appropriate educational experiences. Planning for early childhood education should include variety in program formats, in instructional approaches, and in provision of opportunities for children and families to be involved in educational experiences.

The effectiveness of education is enhanced through the meaningful involvement of families. Parents must participate in decisions pertaining to the planning, implementation, and evaluation of educational programs designed for young children. New Jersey children reflect the varied ethnic and language composition of our population. Their diversity and that of their families are a source of pride and strength. Varied programs are necessary to meet the diverse needs of children and communities, even as we educate all children to assume a rightful, responsible place in society.

In the final analysis, teachers embody the words of statements of philosophy. They become the means of delivering planned educational experiences to children. Personal and professional qualifications for teachers of young children must be high and selection procedures stringent. In both pre-service and in-service training, early childhood teachers should study young children and their families, practice ever-improving strategies of instructing them, analyze curricular approaches, and engage in evaluation of their own efforts and the progress of the children. The participation of classroom teachers in the development of curricula is essential.

Through early childhood education, we can enrich the life experiences of children, and we may circumvent the need for remediation, which is costly in human terms and in material resources. Timing and content of the programs must be tailored to child needs and educational purposes. Often, local district classes for young children, particularly for four-year olds, rely on federal programs and grants. However, we cannot abrogate our responsibilities to these sources. We must assert leadership in utilizing such resources for our own priorities for young children in New Jersey.

P. Paul Tieri
President, State Board of Education

June 6, 1979

Fred G. Burke
Secretary, State Board of Education

Reaffirmed, January 5, 1983

Appendix B.
Kindergarten in New Jersey

Facts about Statutes and Code

State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
225 WEST STATE STREET
CN 500
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625

KINDERGARTEN IN NEW JERSEY

Prepared by Tynette W. Hills
Education Program Specialist I
Division of General Academic Education
1984

Admission to Kindergarten

Local boards of education in New Jersey establish school entrance dates and policies based upon the following statutes:

N.J.S.A. 18A:44-2. Establishment of kindergarten; eligibility for admission

The board of education of any district may establish a kindergarten school or kindergarten department in any school under its control, and may admit to such kindergarten school or department any child over the age of four and under the age of five and shall admit to such kindergarten school or department any child over the age of five and under the age of six years who is a resident of the district.

N.J.S.A. 18A:38-6 Time of admission of pupils; first school year

Pupils who have never attended any public or private school may be admitted to a public school on or before October 1 following the opening of the school for the fall term, and at no other time except by a majority vote of all the members of the board of education of the district in which the school is situated.

N.J.S.A. 18A:38-5 Admission of pupils under age

No child under the age of five years shall be admitted to any public school, except such as may be provided pursuant to law for children of his age.

No board of education shall be required to accept by transfer from public or private school any pupil who was not eligible by reason of age for admission on October 1 of that school year, but the board may in its discretion admit any such pupil if he or she meets such entrance requirements as may be established by rules or regulations of the board.

State School Aid for Kindergarten Pupils

State school aid payments are based on statutes providing for equalization support for all school districts for all legally enrolled pupils, with additional financial reimbursement for special categories (e.g., pupils in special education, bilingual education, state compensatory education, etc.).

Administrative Code permits the legal enrollment of kindergarten pupils who are over the age of four years and under the age of six years. Computing the ages for kindergarten by directions for school registers results in a spread of ages as shown for children aged four and five years, by those birthdays nearest to September 1, 1984.

YEAR OF BIRTH	1979	1980	1981
Born during January or February	6	5	4
Born during all other months	5	4	3

This computation assumes September 1 as the mid-point of a twelve month span to obtain the nearest critical birthday. It results in a spread of chronological ages as shown for four and five-year-olds.

YEAR OF BIRTH	1979	1980	1981
January	6	5 (4-8)	4 (3-8)
February	6	5 (4-7)	4 (3-7)
March	5 (5-6)	4 (4-6)	
April	5 (5-5)	4 (4-5)	
May	5 (5-4)	4 (4-4)	
June	5 (5-3)	4 (4-3)	
July	5 (5-2)	4 (4-2)	
August	5 (5-1)	4 (4-1)	
SEPTEMBER	5 (5-0)	4 (4-0)	
October	5 (4-11)	4 (3-11)	
November	5 (4-10)	4 (3-10)	
December	5 (4-9)	4 (3-9)	
	5 year olds	4 year olds	

Potential Eligibles for Kindergarten 1984

Local boards set cut-off dates, and the great majority lie between October 1 and December 1, with another significant percentage between December 2 and January 1. A few districts have still later cut-off dates.

Curriculum Requirements

The curriculum of kindergarten programs is developed at the local level. Minimum requirements are set forth in the New Jersey Administrative Code, as follows:

CHAPTER 26

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

SUBCHAPTER 2. APPROVAL OF PUBLIC KINDERGARTENS

6:26-2.1 School attendance

A school day shall consist of not less than four hours of actual school work, except that in an approved kindergarten one continuous session of 2½ hours may be considered a full day.

6:26-2.2 Teacher certification

Every kindergarten teacher shall be properly certified.

6:26-2.3 Program, facilities and materials

(a) A balanced program in an approved facility with adequate equipment, materials and supplies shall be provided each child.

(b) This program is to be designed to meet the individual needs of every child and may include instruction in reading and other subjects when it has been determined that a child is ready for such instruction by the teacher of the class.

6:26-2.4 Enrollment

The maximum enrollment for any kindergarten class shall not exceed 25 pupils per teacher, except by permission of the county superintendent of schools. In granting exceptions the county superintendent shall give full consideration to the need for employment of another teacher or teacher aide.

As amended, R.1970, d.18 eff. February 17, 1970.
See: 1 N.J.R. 28(c), 2 N.J.R. 23(c).

School Attendance

School attendance requirements are elaborated as follows in the New Jersey Administrative Code 6:20-1.3:

(n) Whenever any school district initiates a program for kindergarten classes where it is deemed advisable that the kindergarten children attend less than a 2½ hour session, such children shall be considered present in the school register under the following conditions:

1. The shortened sessions shall not be extended beyond the first three days of school.

2. Such shortened sessions shall consist of not less than one hour of actual attendance.

3. The provision for such shortened sessions shall be made upon the recommendations of the superintendent of schools or the county superintendent of schools in school districts where there is no superintendent; shall be approved by the board of education, and shall be incorporated in the school calendar for any year in which such shortened sessions are approved.

Teacher Qualifications

Teachers of kindergarten must hold a valid instructional certificate, for either K-8 (elementary) or nursery instruction, or an elementary or nursery endorsement. (N.J.S.A. 18A:44-3; N.J.A.C. 6:11-8.3).

Provisions for Nursery Classes

Permissive statutes pertaining to nursery classes are as follows:

N.J.S.A. 18A:44-1 Establishment of nursery schools or departments; eligibility for admission

The board of education of any district may establish a nursery school or a nursery department in any school under its control, and shall admit to such nursery school or department any child who is under the age at which children are admitted to other schools or classes in such district.

Nursery school teachers are required to hold valid nursery instructional certificates.

Nursery pupils are not included in the computation of state school aid.

TWH/dm/NT2-27-1

Appendix C.
Studies of All-Day Kindergarten Programs

-- Comparative Findings
-- Annotated Reviews of Literature

FIGURE 1. STUDIES OF ALL-DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS*

Study/Author**	Research Question/Objective	Program	Findings and Conclusions
Adcock, Hess, & Mitchell, Maryland Dept. of Education, 1980	How does full-day attendance affect academic achievement?	State-funded pilot program of one year. 189 urban and rural K pupils (131 in ADED K; 58 in HDED). No systematic selection or random assignment to groups. ADED = 6 hours; HDED = 2 1/2 hours.	Significant differences favoring ADED in every tested area. By post-test HDED functioning within lower level of grade expectation; ADED operating at first grade level on post-test.
		Procedures: pre and post-administration of Met. Ach. Survey Battery (visual discrimination, numeration, problem-solving, listening comprehension in preprimer form; word reading added for for primer form).	CONCLUSIONS: All-day effective. Gives additional time for skill acquisition. Since research shows stability of gains, it has the potential to reduce rates of retention and special placement. Therefore, can be cost effective.
Alper & Wright, Phoenix, 1979	To provide more instructional activities designed for individuals and small groups; to increase parent participation.	A three-month experimental program, for 98 experimental pupils; 98 other pupils were controls. ADED = 5 hours. Experimental program had a class size of 12, instead of 25; a lunch program; field trips; reinforcement and elaboration of regular program concepts; parent participation program; teacher visits to children's homes.	Substantially higher scores on Metropolitan Readiness (auditory, visual, language pre-reading); positive parent attitudes expressed in questionnaire.

* K = kindergarten
HDED = half-day, everyday kindergarten
ADED = all-day, everyday kindergarten
**Full citations appear on page 90.

Study/Author	Research Question/Objective	Program	Findings and Conclusions
Gittelman, Hamilton Township, NJ; 1982, 1983	How did the pilot ADED program affect the achievement, behavior, and attitudes of pupils, and the attitudes of parents, professional staff, and aides?	Pilot ADED program in four comparable schools, to provide more instructional time. Curriculum unchanged, with deliberate effort not to advance the ADED children academically. Evaluational data included attendance and behavior records, Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) as pre and post-test and report cards. Spring results of California Achievement Test (CAT), given throughout the district, also used. Questionnaires sampled the attitudes of the adults involved.	Children: ADED pupils significantly higher in gains on CTBS math section; higher, but not significantly on other CTBS sub-tests and CAT. No significant differences: --social development or work habits --students' attendance --creative expression --language Report card data on gains in reading and number readiness and physical development favored HDED (i.e., rates of gain greater in HDED, but absolute grades higher for ADED.) ADED children rated same as HDED or higher on all other areas. Parents: All parents endorsed the K, but ADED parents reported more learning. HDED parents wanted more time for individualization. Most parents preferred ADED.

Study/Author	Research Question/Objective	Program	Findings and Conclusions
			Teachers: Teachers preferred ADED: wanted the time; found it more satisfactory to teach. Most aides also preferred ADED.
Harmon, 1982	Will the increased time available in an extended day kindergarten help the pupils' achievement?	Children randomly selected from one extended day and one HDED in each of three schools similiar in ethnic composition, mobility rate, and economic status. The extended time was used to provide more individualized instruction.	On CAT at end of the K year, the extended day pupils showed higher achievement, but differences were not statistically significant, at p = .05.
Herwig, J.E., & Pinsky, D. (1982)	What happens to the teacher when kindergarten becomes an all-day program?	A survey of several states, asking about trends in K, reasons for extending to ADED, funding, and enrollment. A detailed study of K teachers in Iowa.	Teachers reported some disadvantages with ADED: pupil fatigue, time for teachers, curriculum needs. They reported these advantages for ADED: improved academic achievement; more time for instruction and special projects, less pressure; opportunity for teachers to interact with other teachers; enhanced feeling of professional participation.

Study/Author	Research Question/Objective	Program	Findings and Conclusions
			Authors conclude that preservice training should be improved and made more relevant; that inservice training be designed and offered throughout the initial years of the change over; that administrative support be provided for cooperative planning, articulation between grade levels, and curriculum revision.
Humphrey, Evansville, 1980	To increase growth in cognitive, psychomotor, affective, and linguistic skills beyond those of half-day pupils.	179 pupils in experimental programs 1978-9 (217 controls); 229 in 1979-80 (199 controls). Program for both experimental and controls was same. Longer time in ADED was used to elaborate instruction. ADED pupils, when ready, moved forward toward formal, academic instruction. Measures: CAT; Boehm Test of Basic Concepts (BTBC); Gates-MacGintie in first grade.	Children: CAT -- significantly higher especially in pre-reading for ADED. BTBC: ADED post-test significantly higher than pre-test. Gates-MacGinite, first grade: significant difference favoring pupils from ADED. Parents: most parents positive toward K program, regardless of length. Majority would choose ADED. More ADED parents rated children's learning at higher levels.

Study/Author	Research Question/Objective	Program	Findings and Conclusions
			Teachers: K teachers favored ADED; first grade teachers undecided. Conclusions: Objectives met; ADED a feasible program supported by parents and teachers.
Humphrey, Evansville, 1983	To study any long-term benefits among pupils from the 1979 and 1980 pilot all-day kindergarten programs.	Follow up study of pupils who had been in the original ADED study cited immediately above. All subjects were enrolled in the same schools where they had attended kindergarten programs. Measures: Piers Harris Children's Self Concept, CTBS. Others were report card measures and pupil's attitudes toward school. Attitudes of teachers and parents also surveyed.	Differences favoring ADED in: Piers Harris Children's Self Concept and CTBS; report card measures, including conduct; grade repetition records. ADED pupils enthusiastic about later school experience. Parents and teachers positive toward ADED K.
Lysiak & Evans, 1976	To compare the effectiveness of six experimental curricula and the all-day kindergarten schedule	916 pupils from 111 classes, in K programs with various objectives and curricula, e.g., Follow Through, bilingual, Title 1 ESEA, etc. Six indenfiable curricula examined. Pre-tested by BTBS and post-tested by Metropolitan. Readiness (Met.); data analyzed by	ADED produced higher readiness effects for low-SES and for high-SES children. Same findings for structured curricula (e.g. Lippincott). The Study did not collect comparable data on middle SES children: therefore, cannot draw conclusions.

Study/Author	Research Question/Objective	Program	Findings and Conclusions
		ANCOVAs and multiple regression techniques.	about length of day or kind of program for them.
McClinton & Topping, Colorado, 1981	Does lengthening kindergarten day affect first grade adjustment?	80 children (8 from each of 10 1st grades in central Colorado), evenly divided by sex and HDED or ADED programs. (ADED = 4 hours, 15 minutes; HDED = 2 hours, 40 minutes) No systematic differences in curriculum or teaching strategies. CTBS at end of K year showed no significant differences by classes.	Teachers, who did not know the purpose of the study or the kind of program the pupils had come from, rated children from ADED as more able in social and academic adjustment, during the sixth week of school.
Nieman & Gastright, Cincinnati, 1981	How stable are the gains from the combination of pre-kindergarten and ADED K?	An 8 year follow-up study of 410 Title 1 ESEA pupils was undertaken on pupils who had been in a combination of pre-school and ADED. Measures: Met. Achievement subtest in math and reading for 4th and 8th grade; Met. and BTBC for K. No programmatic differences were reported.	At end of 4th and 8th grades, ADED pupils scored higher on total reading and total math subtests of Met. Achievement. ADED pupils also had lower incidence of repeating a grade and placement in special education. In K testing, ADED pupils significantly higher on BTBS and Met. Percentile rank of achievement declined from 4th to 8th grade. The findings are discussed in terms of suitable intervene tions.

Study/Author	Research Question/Objective	Program	Findings and Conclusions
Winter & Klein, Missouri, 1970	Does extending the kindergarten day make a difference in the achievement of educationally advantaged and disadvantaged pupils?	Of 13 disadvantaged children, 6 were given an extended session of tutorial approach, addressed to individual needs. Program provided 90 additional minutes of instruction. Of 55 advantaged children in the study, 26 were identified for the extended day. Program consisted of independent activities, special projects, individualized instruction, home visits, and parent education. Measures: Met., Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT), publishers' tests, teacher ratings.	Disadvantaged pupils in extended day were higher on Met. Ach. Test. At end of 1st grade, they were higher on SESAT. Publishers' tests and teacher ratings: extended day pupils higher. Lack of differences in standardized tests explained as too-low ceiling for the all-day group. Teachers and parents were positive to full-day program, citing children's enthusiasm, significance of home visits, and observable progress of children.

Bibliography of STUDIES OF ALL-DAY AND EXTENDED-DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS

Adcock, E. P., Hess, J. M., & Mitchell, E. R. (1980). A comparison of half-day and full-day kindergarten classes on academic achievement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 194 205.)

Alper, C. L., & Wright, D. L. (1979). Extended day kindergarten plus parent involvement: A combination that works. Phi Delta Kappan, 61(1), 68.

Gittelman, V. (1983). Full Scale evaluation of the full-day kindergarten pilot program. Hamilton Township, N.J.: Author, Hamilton Township Schools, Department of Elementary Education.

Harmon, D.L. (1982). Extended-day kindergarten vs. half-day kindergarten achievement differences. Masters Thesis, Kean College of New Jersey. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 215 784.)

Herwig, J.E., & Pinsky D. (November, 1982). Full-day kindergarten: What do teachers think about it? A paper presented to the Annual Conference of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Washington, D.C.

Humphrey, J. (1980). A study of the effectiveness of full-day kindergarten programs. Evansville, IN: Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation.

Humphrey, J. (1983). A longitudinal study of the effectiveness of full-day kindergarten. Evansville, IN: Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation.

Lysiak, F., & Evans, C. L. (1976). Kindergarten -- Fun and games or readiness for first grade: A comparison of seven kindergarten curricula. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 121 803.)

McClinton, S. L., & Topping, C. (1981). Extended day kindergarten: Are the differences intangible? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 211 199.)

Nieman, R. H., & Gastright, J. F. (1981). The long term effects of ESEA Title I preschool and all day kindergarten: An eight year follow-up study. Cincinnati: Cincinnati Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 198 949.)

Winter, M., & Klein, A. E. (1970). Extending the kindergarten day: Does it make a difference in the achievement of educationally advantaged and disadvantaged pupils? Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 087 534.)

REVIEWS OF RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION STUDIES ON EXTENDED KINDERGARTEN SCHEDULING

Beckner, T. L., Harner, C. H., Kipps, B. M., and others. (1978). A study of the relationship of kindergarten class size, length, and scheduling of the kindergarten day and teacher self-concept to school success. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 165 891.)

A graduate class in education undertook a review of the literature of kindergarten program components, such as class size, length of day, and teaching self-concepts, in relation to effects. The frustration of kindergarten teachers in trying to work with two classes of children and their parents was highlighted. Diminished self-confidence and esteem of teachers were hypothesized, with possible detrimental effects on children's self-esteem. From their review, the authors concluded that smaller class sizes are associated with several beneficial classroom instructional practices, as well as higher achievement. Teachers of all-day classes reported more satisfaction and less frustration than those who taught two half-day sessions in the course of a school day.

Olerich, M. L. (April, 1979). Kindergarten: All day everyday? (ERIC Document Service No. 179 282.)

Olerich presents a history of kindergarten scheduling, showing that kindergarten began as a full-day program and was later altered to accommodate more children, in the aftermath of WWII. She contrasts the length of day typical for U.S. children with that of European and Russian children. The article also cites research on outcomes, which favor full-day pupils, and includes the position paper of the Minnesota Association for Childhood Education, which makes a case for full-day programming.

Salzer, R. T. (November 11-14, 1982). Middle class parents' attitudes toward all-day kindergarten. Paper presented to National Association for the Education of young Children, Washington, D.C. (ERIC Document Service No. 227 945.)

Salzer presents a review of studies undertaken by local boards of education to survey attitudes of parents in western New York toward all-day kindergarten. It was found that those in favor believed that all-day kindergarten could build upon children's preschool experience, provide more education for those who needed it, and assist parents in meeting the responsibilities of day-long arrangements for children. Those opposed believed that children were not "ready" for such programs and that an all-day kindergarten was not the best use of children's time.

Stinard, T. A. (April, 1982). Synopsis of research on kindergarten scheduling: Half-day, everyday; full-day, alternate day; full-day, everyday. Cedar Rapids, Iowa: Grant Wood Area Education Agency. (ERIC Document Service No. 219 151.)

Stinard reviewed and summarized empirical evidence on the effects of three different patterns of kindergarten scheduling. He found eight studies which compared pupils in daily half-day and daily full-day, schedules. The evidence regarding cognitive and academic outcomes strongly favored the pupils in the daily full-day, schedules significantly. In the studies reviewed, however, there were no significant socioemotional differences.

Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction. (1980). A comprehensive study and evaluation of three types of kindergarten programs. Final report. Madison, WI: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 201 384.)

After examining the research literature and the experience of several school districts in Wisconsin and neighboring states, the authors reached these conclusions: the all-day everyday program offers educational advantages, although it is more expensive; the half-day everyday programs are the next best alternative; there is inadequate research on curriculum in all-day programs. Data are presented on comparative costs and use of available instructional time.

APPENDIX D.
Summary of Typical Action Procedures of Local Boards of Education

Prepared by Tynette W. Hills
Division of General Academic Education
New Jersey State Department of Education

ALL-DAY KINDERGARTEN

TYPICAL COURSE OF ACTION BY LOCAL BOARDS OF EDUCATION

I. Precipitating Factors

- A. Instructional Concerns
- B. Program Evaluation Concerns
- C. External Influences (parents' requests, community needs, etc.)

II. Preliminary Board Action

- A. Consideration of Request for Policy Change
- B. Request for Report and Recommendations

III. Establishment of Study Committee

- A. Administrative Action
- B. Composition of Study Committee
  1. Educators and lay persons
  2. Typical composition: Kindergarten and first grade teachers, reading specialist and/or curriculum coordinator; principal and/or assistant superintendent; parents; school board members
- C. Timeframe of Several Months to a School Year
- D. Scope and Focus of Study
  1. Study of all-day kindergarten in relation to current program
  2. Effects of the change on the program
  3. Recommendations

IV. The Study

- A. Statement of the Problem: <u>Why Is The Topic Under Study</u>?

B. Summary Description of Current Kindergarten: What Are The Purposes and Accomplishments of The Current Program?

C. Optional Evaluative Statement: What Are The Strengths and Unmet Needs in the Current Program?

(This may be a part of the Statement of the Problem.)

D. Summary of Research on All-Day Kindergarten: What Kinds of Differences Does It Make?

E. Reports of Visits and Interviews: What Is the New Jersey Experience?

F. Identification of Curricular and Administrative Requirements: What Additional Resources Would Be Necessary?

G. Conclusions about Potential Effects of the Change Within the District: What Differences Might All-Day Kindergarten Make to Us?

H. Formulation of Recommendations for Board Action: What Is the Best Course of Action, Given All the Variables?

V. The Committee's Report and Recommendations

A. Summary Report on the Committee's Work

B. Conclusions from Their Findings

C. Recommendations

Often, they recommend a pilot study prior to full implementation.

VI. Action of the Local Board

A. Acceptance of Report

B. Decision to Establish an All-Day Program

1. Plan for pilot study or limited trial

2. Plan for full implementation

B. Decision Not to Establish an All-Day Program

1. Plan for reconsideration later

2. Consideration of other options, i.e., extended day, revised curriculum, etc.

TWH/dm/NF1-17

APPENDIX E.

RESOURCES FOR ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE

For additional assistance with the planning and programmatic issues raised in this resource guide, educators may want to investigate the agencies and centers listed below.

1. Regional Curriculum Services Center - North, 15 South Munn Avenue, East Orange, New Jersey 07017; 201-266-8660.

   Regional Curriculum Services Center-Central. 75 Racetrack Road, East Brunswick, New Jersey 08816; 201-390-6030 or 6031.

   Regional Curriculum Services Center - South, Tanyard and Salina Roads, Sewell, New Jersey 08080;

   Based on state and/or county needs, the regional curriculum services centers carry out the following kinds of functions for school districts located within their service areas: awareness workshops, in-service training and staff development workshops, dissemination of departmental publications, dissemination of information, and limited and specified consultative services. Their staffs include specialists in areas of curriculum, instruction and evaluation. Schedules of workshops and listings of staff members are available from each of the centers.

2. Learning Resource Center - Northern Region, 15 South Munn Street, East Orange, New Jersey 07017; 201-266-8660.

   Learning Resource Center - Northern Satellite, Normandy Park Administration Building, Normandy Parkway, Morristown, New Jersey 07960; 201-539-0331 or 0337.

   Learning Resource Center - Central Region, 75 Racetrack Road, East Brunswick, New Jersey 08816; 201-390-6038 or 6039.

   Learning Resource Center - South Jersey Region, 207 Delsea Drive, Route #47, R.D. #4, Box 209, Sewell, New Jersey 08080; 609-228-6000.

   Printed information, literature searches and curricular resource materials, including some materials from validated kindergarten projects are available from the learning resource centers.

3. National Diffusion Network Facilitator Project, Educational Resource and Referral Center, 207 Delsea Drive, Route #47, R.D. #4, Box 209, Sewell, New Jersey 08080; 609-228-6000.

   The National Diffusion Network (NDN) Facilitator Project provides information and schedules awareness and training workshops on validated programs within the NDN. Information about effective kindergarten programs is available from this project.

APPENDIX F.

USE OF CHAPTER 1/STATE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FUNDS FOR EXTENDED-DAY PREKINDERGARTEN AND KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS

Under certain circumstances, local boards of education may obtain funds for an extended-day kindergarten.

An LEA may have a program design where the pre-kindergarten or kindergarten morning session (1/2 day) is a board session and the afternoon session is a Chapter 1 supplemental program. If not all of the children enrolled in the district kindergarten program are eligible for Chapter 1 with State Compensatory Education funds. Students scoring below state and/or district norms may be included in such coordinated programs.

However, State Compensatory Education funds may not be used for pre-kindergarten supplemental services.

Those districts that allocate funds for local remediation may serve students above the district norm.

For further information contact Howard J. Shelton, Manager, Office of Compensatory Education, New Jersey State Department of Education, at: (609) 292-8390.

FEEDBACK FORM

ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN: RESOURCES FOR DECISION MAKING

Please rate this document on each of the following points using a scale of 1 (highest rating) to 5 (lowest rating). Your frank evaluation and comments will help us to improve our products.

1. Does the document provide a useful overview of the issues involved in the all day kindergarten program?

   1 2 3 4 5

2. Is the information presented in this document both current and accurate?

   1 2 3 4 5

3. Are the issues surrounding the all-day kindergarten fairly and objectively presented?

   1 2 3 4 5

4. Would this document be helpful as a basic resource to your district if you were considering establishing an all-day kindergarten program?

   1 2 3 4 5

5. Is the document easy to read in regard to style, organization of information, and form?

   1 2 3 4 5

Comments: (Please reference the specific item above the number if relevant to your comment. General comments will also be helpful, of course.)

Return to: Bureau of Student Behavior and Development
New Jersey Department of Education
CN 500
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625